DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 948 RC 017 836

TITLE Reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978. Hearing on S. 2167 To Reauthorize the Tribally Controlled College Assistance Act of 1978 and the Navajo Community College Act and on S. 2213 To Increase the Federal Contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program, before the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, United States Senate, One Hundred First Congress, Second Session (Bismarck, North Dakota, April 9, 1990).

INSTITUTION Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT NO Senate-Hrg-101-692

PUB DATE 90

NOTE 140p.; Some pages contain small, light print.

AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.

PUB TYPE Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; *Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; *Federal Aid; Federal Indian Relationship; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Financial Needs; Financial Support; Hearings; Higher Education; *School Support; Trust Responsibility (Government)

IDENTIFIERS American Indian Higher Education Consortium; Congress 101st; Navajo Community College AZ; Reauthorization Legislation; *Tribally Controlled Comm Coll Assist Act 1978; Tribally Controlled Education; Tribally Controlled Schools

ABSTRACT

Testimony on two bills dealing with federal funding for American Indian tribally controlled colleges is reported. Introduced by Senator John McCain (Arizona), S. 2167 seeks to reauthorize the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 and the Navajo Community College Act. Introduced by Senator Kent Conrad (North Dakota), S. 2213 seeks to increase the federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program. Statements are offered by representatives of various agencies and groups, including the following: American Indian Higher Education Consortium; Navajo Community College, Tsaile, Arizona; Fort Berthold Indian Reservation; Turtle Mountain Chippewa Tribe; Salish Kootenai College, Bismarck, North Dakota; American Indian Higher Education Consortium Student Congress; Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Indian Education, U.S. Department of the Interior; Bush Foundation, Bismarck, North Dakota; North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota. A report prepared by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, titled "The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act: Why More Funds Are Needed," is appended. (TES)

S. Hrg. 101-692

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED326348

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS
UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 2167

TO REAUTHORIZE THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978 AND THE NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT

S. 2213

TO INCREASE THE FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENDOWMENT PROGRAM

APRIL 9, 1990
BISMARCK, ND

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC 017836

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1990

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii, *Chairman*
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona, *Vice Chairman*

DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona
QUENTIN N. BURDICK, North Dakota
THOMAS A. DASCHLE, South Dakota
KENT CONRAD, North Dakota
HARRY REID, Nevada
FRANK H. MURKOWSKI, Alaska
THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
SLADE GORTON, Washington

ALAN R. PARKER, *Staff Director*
PATRICIA M. ZELL, *Chief Counsel*
ERIC EBERHARD, *Minority Staff Director/Counsel*

(II)

CONTENTS

Page

S. 2767 and S. 2213, text of 2

Statements:

Archambault, David, president, American Indian Higher Education Consortium, president, Standing Rock Community College 18

Conrad, Hon. Kent, U.S. Senator from North Dakota 1

Gishey, Laurence, president, Navajo Community College, Tsaile, AZ 28

Lone Fight, Edward, tribal chairman, Fort Berthold Indian Reservation 23

Martin-Kekahbah, Twila, tribal chairperson, Turtle Mountain Chippewa Tribe 21

McDonald, Joseph, president, Salish Kootenai College, Bismarck, ND 13

Moore, Robert D., president, American Indian Higher Education Consortium Student Congress 24

Parisian, Edward, Deputy to the Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, Director, Indian Education, Department of the Interior 30

Shepard, Stanley, senior program associate, Bush Foundation, Bismarck, ND 7

Sullivan, Robert, director, special projects, North Dakota State University, Fargo, ND 9

APPENDIX

Prepared statements:

Archambault, David 54

Bordeaux, Irene and Lionel, chairperson and president, Sinte Gleska College Board of Directors 78

Boyer, Paul (with attachments) 92

Gishey, Laurence 69

Lone Fight, Edward 83

Martin-Kekahbah, Twila 58

McCain, Hon. John, U.S. Senator from Arizona, vice chairman, Select Committee on Indian Affairs 101

McDonald, Joseph 51

Moore, Robert D. 87

Parisian, Edward 74

Shepard, Stanley 46

Sullivan, Robert (with letter) 41

Additional material submitted for the record:

American Indian Higher Education Consortium, report 105

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978

MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1990

U.S. SENATE,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Bismarck, ND

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:16 a.m., in the Radisson Hotel, Hon. Kent Conrad (acting chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senator Conrad.

STATEMENT OF HON. KENT CONRAD, U.S. SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Senator CONRAD. If we could bring this hearing to order.

If people could please be seated, we could have a chance to begin this hearing.

As you know, this is a Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs hearing on the reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978.

Good morning. I would like to welcome everyone to this morning's hearing.

Today we are here to discuss the reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, the principal mechanism through which tribal community colleges receive Federal funding each year.

Two bills have been introduced in the Senate to address this year's reauthorization. The first simply reauthorizes current law. The second, which I introduced on March 1, doubles the Federal endowment contribution to the colleges. It is clear that tribal colleges cannot hope to become financially stable until they identify funding sources that don't depend on the fiscal whims and constraints of the Federal Government. Building endowments now will help lead to that stability.

[Text of S. 2167 and S. 2213 follows:]

101st CONGRESS
2d Session

S. 2167

To reauthorize the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 and the Navajo Community College Act.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 22 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1990

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. GRAHAM) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs

A BILL

To reauthorize the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 and the Navajo Community College Act.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGES.

(a) GRANT PROGRAMS.—Subsection (a) of section 110 of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1810(a)) is amended by striking out "1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1990, 1991, and 1992".

(b) ENDOWMENT PROGRAM.—Section 306 of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1836) is amended by striking out "1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990" and inserting in lieu thereof "1990, 1991, and 1992".

SEC. 2. NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

Paragraph (3) of section 5(a) of the Navajo Community College Act (25 U.S.C. 640c–3) is amended by striking out "1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990" and inserting in lieu thereof "1990, 1991, and 1992".

101ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2213

To increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 1 (legislative day, JANUARY 29), 1990

Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DECONCINI, and Mr. PASCRELL) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs

---

A BILL

To increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That title III of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1831, et seq.) is amended—

(1) by inserting "half of" after "equal to" in section 302(b)(2)(B);

(2) by striking out "an equal amount of Federal capital contribution" in section 302(b)(4) and inserting

in lieu thereof "an amount of Federal capital contribution equal to twice the amount of such withdrawal".

(3) by inserting "twice" after "equal to" in section 305 each place it appears,

(4) by striking out "$350,000" in section 305(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$750,000", and

(5) by striking out "$5,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1987, 1988, 1989, and 1990" in section 306(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993, and 1994".

As I have stated on the Senate floor more than once, the impact of tribal colleges on the social and educational fabric of Indian reservations is absolutely undeniable. I have seldom seen institutions accomplish as much, and with such limited resources, as do tribal colleges.

In 1981, per-pupil funding for tribal colleges was $3,100. However, by 1989, it had dropped to $1,964—less than 50 percent of what a small State institution would receive in equivalent appropriations, and less than one-sixth the funding per student provided, for example, to Howard University in Washington, DC.

Last year, I had the privilege of addressing the graduation at Turtle Mountain Community College. That experience made a lasting impression on me. What impressed me was the obvious impact Turtle Mountain Community College had on the self esteem of its graduates. What impressed me was the evident contribution of the college to developing the economy of the reservation, and developing the minds, skills, and values of its students.

I have been told that Indian students who first attend a 2-year tribal community college are more likely to complete a 4-year college degree than those who enter college straight out of high school. That speaks to the value of these institutions in improving the educational achievements of Indian students.

These are exciting times for tribal colleges. The recent report by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has provided important insight into the value of these institutions. The Select Committee on Indian Affairs has requested full funding for the colleges—$5,820 per student and $5 million for the endowment—for the coming fiscal year. And an increasing number of private foundations are investing in the future of Indian education.

Tribal colleges are beginning to receive the attention that they clearly deserve. I am particularly proud of the four title I colleges in North Dakota—Standing Rock, Fort Berthold, Little Hoop, and Turtle Mountain—all of which are now fully accredited. And while it is not funded under the Act, I also wish to acknowledge the many contributions being made by United Tribes Technical College.

Today, we will not only hear testimony about the contributions already being made by tribal colleges, but also about how to change the current authorization in a way that will most effectively aid tribal colleges in their mission.

Today we will hear from the Bureau of Indian Affairs [BIA] tribal and non-tribal educators, students, and tribal leaders. We will also hear why private foundations are providing financial support to the colleges.

I would like to thank all of our witnesses for being here today.

Before we begin, I would just like to stress, once again, the profound commitment that I have developed after watching firsthand the contributions that the tribal community colleges are making. All of us know that Indian Country has suffered through some very difficult times. Over the last decade, the level of support has been constantly declining. The levels of unemployment, suffering, and hurt on our Indian reservations has grown.

We have a positive obligation to help, and I can think of no better way to help than to concentrate on the future. The future lies with education.

I wish my colleagues in the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs could have been with me that day when I was at Turtle Mountain Community College for the graduation. The look in the eyes of those students who were graduating—the very evident self-pride, the sense that they could make a difference—was so clear that I think it would have persuaded all of my colleagues that we ought to do what I am proposing this year, to double the level of the endowment for the community colleges. That would be a good beginning to start emphasizing the educational opportunities that exist in Indian Country.

That's what this hearing is all about—to focus on the opportunity and the future.

First we will start with an initial panel, panel I, that will include Stanley Shepherd, the senior program associate of the Bush Foundation—as I am reading your names, please come up to the podium and the witness table—Robert Sullivan, director, special projects, North Dakota State University, and Joseph McDonald, president, Salish Kootenai College, Pablo, MT.

I want to welcome the panel. I want to indicate to the people that are here in the audience that this is an official hearing of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs and that we will conduct this hearing just as we would any official hearing in Washington, DC. The same rules will apply here as would apply if we were in the Nation's Capitol.

With that, let me welcome the first panel, and call on Mr. Shepard, again, the senior program associate of the Bush Foundation.

Welcome Mr. Shepard.

STATEMENT OF STANLEY SHEPARD, SENIOR PROGRAM ASSOCIATE, THE BUSH FOUNDATION, BISMARCK, ND

Mr. SHEPARD. Thank you.

As I understand it, our remarks are tuned to about 5 minutes apiece. Is that correct?

Senator CONRAD. That is correct. Your complete written statement will appear in the record as if given in full. And if you could summarize that statement, we would be most appreciative.

Mr. SHEPARD. Let me just say a few remarks about the organization that I represent.

The Bush Foundation is located in Saint Paul, MN. It is a private grant-making organization of the same type as the Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, and so forth. Mr. Bush, after whom our Foundation is named, was one of the founders of the 3M Company in Saint Paul, and our Foundation is based on the money that he left when he passed away.

About 50 percent of the money that the Bush Foundation gives away goes to education. We do support other program areas such as human services, health, the arts, and so forth, but our primary emphasis is in education. And within education, I think it's fair to say that the primary emphasis is in higher education—colleges and universities.

We call ourselves a regional foundation, which means that we don't make grants all over the United States, or internationally. We concentrate on a three State area—Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. We do have a couple of programs that are exceptions to that, and one of those is our grant for Indian tribal colleges. I will tell you more about that in 1 minute. But primarily we are a three State foundation.

I wish that I could tell you that our support for Indian colleges materialized out of our own foresight and thinking, but it really didn't. I think we first learned about them as a result of a request that came to us from one of the tribal colleges about 13 or 14 years ago. We were really unaware that such institutions existed. But over the course of the last 14 years, I have personally—and some of my colleagues have joined me—visited a number of the tribal colleges and our Foundation Board has committed itself to very enthusiastic and sincere support, to the extent that we're able, for the tribal colleges. So far that support is limited to the fully accredited colleges—a judgment made by our Board, which I guess could be debatable, but nonetheless, those are the ground rules as of the moment.

Bush Foundation support takes two forms. The most common type of grant that we have made to the tribal colleges, and will continue to make, is support for what we call faculty development. This simply means that Bush money—generally in the ration of about $25,000 a year—can be used by the colleges to support various types of activities engaged in by faculty members designed to improve their own teaching abilities, improve their courses, and design new curriculum segments for the college, but primarily the money is designed to help the faculty members.

Many of you in this room who are faculty members I know have participated in some of these things. Our feeling was that geographically these colleges are located rather far away from urban sites. The opportunity for faculty members to go to a University, take time off in the summer, and engage in professional development are limited. Therefore, it was our hope that this extra type of money from our Foundation would be helpful in those respects.

The other form of Bush Foundation support is less frequent, but occasionally we do support some of the tribal colleges in the Dakotas in capital improvements. We helped repair a roof down at Standing Rock, so Dave Archambault would not get wet when it rained. We also helped to build a classroom building out in Pine Ridge in South Dakota, as well as others. But the primary emphasis of our Foundation in its grant-making has been in faculty development.

I guess the final comment I would make is that about 3 years ago our Board concluded that the contribution that these colleges were making to Indian people throughout the Nation was so significant—and our Board was so enthusiastic about the kind of support that we were providing—that we broke out of our regional limits and decided to support accredited tribally controlled colleges wherever they existed. They didn't have to be just in Minnesota and the two Dakotas. We would look at the proposals of accredited colleges, wherever they were. As a result, we have made about three or four grants outside of those regions.

In summary, I would say that our Foundation has attempted to provide some private money to your institutions for purposes above and beyond what public support has been used for. We don't get into the business of paying the light bills, support faculty salaries, and things like that. That's the core operating support which, for the most part, comes from the Federal Government, but it was our hope that a little injection of private money for additional things like faculty development, professional development, and an occasional capital grant could be helpful to these institutions.

I appreciate the opportunity to have been invited here to testify, and I will answer any questions that anybody has.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Shepard appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much, Mr. Shepard.

We will handle the panel as we typically do in Washington. We will go through the full panel, and then open it up for questions to all of the members of the panel so that we have a chance to get additional views.

Next we'll hear from Robert Sullivan, the director of special projects of North Dakota State University.

Welcome, Bob.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT SULLIVAN, DIRECTOR, SPECIAL PROJECTS, NORTH DAKOTA STATE UNIVERSITY, FARGO, ND

Mr. SULLIVAN. Senator Conrad, other panel members, and guests—can you all hear?

My remarks are based on approximately 20 years experience of working with the reservations in both Dakotas and Montana, and working with the AIHEC schools since their inception.

I was going to address three topics, one of which was the overall impact of the colleges on the reservation, but the Senator has already spoken so eloquently on that, that I am going to have to skip over that part.

The second topic is what the colleges have meant to post-secondary education, on the reservations, and the third topic is what they have meant to economic development.

With respect to the first part of my testimony, I think you can really sum it up very quickly—and I think that the college presidents that are here will agree with me—the Indian Community College Act of 1978 is probably the most significant feat of Federal Legislation since the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. It has literally changed the reservations.

In light of what the Senator was saying, I would strongly urge that every member of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs spend 2 or 3 days at one of these community colleges on any of the reservations, because it is a very inspiring experience. You will see people that have never had anything. These are people in their late thirties and forties, single parents, who go back to that college, end up with an associate degree, and in many cases will go on to another four year school and get a bachelor degree.

The colleges have revitalized the reservations as a whole. There is a change, a sense of hope which I do not believe was there before.

They are also a symbol of the future for the tribes.

From the standpoint of post-secondary education, and what these colleges have meant to the reservations, it would be only a slight exaggeration to say that post-secondary education actually began on the Indian reservations with the tribal community colleges. To be sure, some reservation Indian people sought post-secondary education at outside institutions in earlier years. But lack of money, family obligations, cultural alienation, and other barriers greatly limited their number. And even among the few who enrolled in those outside institutions, the combination of culture shock and inadequate primary and secondary preparation meant that even fewer were successful.

The advent of the tribal colleges changed this situation dramatically. The colleges brought post-secondary education to the reservations. They provided opportunities to people who were either unable or very reluctant to go elsewhere. They provided an Indian context for the educational process. And they also provided not only personalized attention, but the comprehensive remedial work their enrollees needed to overcome their inadequate earlier schooling.

The results have been striking. Not only are the tribal colleges now enrolling approximately 10,000 Indian people—many of whom first earned General Equivalency Diplomas—they are graduating 700 to 800 annually. The majority graduate with two year associate degrees, but a substantial number graduate from Sinte Gleska and Oglala Lakota with bachelors degrees—and Sinte Gleska is also accredited for the Master's in Education.

But perhaps the most impressive statistic is that nearly 30 percent of the students receiving associate degrees or vocational certificates from their tribal colleges go on to pursue more advanced, specialized degrees at outside institutions. And unlike past times, the great majority of these tribal college graduates who transfer to an outside institution following their work at a tribal college are successful in obtaining a four year or more advanced degree.

What happens to all of these tribal college graduates after the completion of their post-secondary education? An overwhelming majority are fully employed, either on their reservation or elsewhere. Indeed, unemployment rates among the tribal college graduates—associate, certificate, or four year degree—average only 15 percent—and even the 15 percent is made up predominantly of people who have just completed their education. This employment outcome speaks for itself when it is compared with overall reservation unemployment rates ranging from 50 to 85 percent.

Furthermore, the production of degreed graduates is only part of the tribal college's role in Indian post-secondary education. The colleges are also very active in providing supplemental courses and training for the Indian population across the reservations, supplemental training which is often linked to improving the individual's employment situation. Likewise, they have been directly responsible for the development and implementation of training programs in connection with reservation economic development—about which more will be said further on. In other words, to repeat what was said earlier, the tribal colleges have had a major impact on every aspect of reservation life.

The relationship between the tribal colleges and the State systems of higher education in their respective States appears to be excellent. I can testify directly to this fact with respect to the two Dakotas and Montana. And I have no information which indicates that the situation is any different in those other States where tribal colleges are located.

The state institutions in the Dakotas and Montana, including the graduate institutions, have a variety of linkages with the tribal colleges. Among other things, arrangements have been developed between the tribal colleges and the State institutions which permit the full articulation of tribal college courses and programs with those of two and four year State institutions. Likewise, joint efforts are going forward currently to develop specialized two year associate curriculums in, for example, pre-engineering and pre-business degrees that will enable associate degree graduates of the tribal colleges to transfer into the professional programs at the universities with no loss of time, that is, at the junior level.

Likewise, here in North Dakota, the State system is in the process of implementing a unique faculty exchange program with the four North Dakota tribal colleges.

More examples of the relationships between the tribal colleges and State institutions could be offered; Montana and Montana State universities have a number of very close linkages with the various tribal colleges in Montana.

But since time is limited, I would simply like to state that, speaking from the standpoint of the State system of higher education, I believe that the tribal colleges have proved to be the critical link that was needed to ensure that the Indian people have the opportunity to take advantage of the public system of higher education in the United States. I can also state that my opinion is shared by university colleagues, and the Commissioner's Office in the North Dakota system of higher education.

The tribal colleges have likewise become a key player in the economic development process on their respective reservations. Clearly, it would be impossible to overestimate the importance of their continuing role in developing a well trained and educated reservation work force. Over the last 20 years the reservations where tribal colleges are in place have become much more attractive as potential locations for outside concerns.

They have likewise witnessed indigenous manufacturing development, e.g., at the Turtle Mountain and Fort Peck Indian reservations. This is not to say that economic development has become easy for the tribal college reservations; they still suffer the disadvantages inherent in remote locations. But a better educated work force and the presence of a tribal college able to provide specialized work force training as needed has substantially enhanced their economic development opportunities.

At the same time, it should be noted that the tribal colleges' contribution to reservation economic development is not limited to improving the quality of the overall reservation work force or the provision of specialized training in connection with specific new reservation enterprises. The colleges have also provided many of their local people with the education and training they need to improve

their employment situation, their income, and the quality of their lives.

Two year programs in business and middle level management have enabled local Indian small business people to improve their operations, and they have enabled other Indian persons to establish small business enterprises. Curriculums in land management and farming and ranching have made very substantial contributions to improving the economies of the Plains reservations.

In a number of instances, the tribal colleges have taken lead roles in enhancing the local economy, e.g., Standing Rock Community College, whose agricultural curriculums and proactive stance have had a major impact on the local farming and ranching economy. In other instances, the colleges have spearheaded efforts to develop new types of economic enterprises. The Blackfeet Community College, for example, is working closely with the tribal leadership to assume the management and further development of what is currently a Federally funded Indian museum in Browning, Montana, with the expected outcome being to substantially enhance tribal income from Glacier Park tourism. Or again, the Fort Peck Community College is leading a tribal effort to develop a major facility for the commercial production of mushrooms.

In short, the colleges have become very important providers of technical assistance and leadership to their tribes in areas ranging from economic planning to the analysis of potential tribal ventures. Many of the tribal college presidents in this room today are active members of the respective tribes' economic development Committees.

What does this mean for the economies of the States, or, for that matter, the Federal economy? Reservation economic development contributes directly to the economies of their respective states and to the Federal treasury. Indian people who are working are paying taxes; they are not receiving welfare. Indian people who are working are likewise contributing directly to the economies of their States, since the majority of their earnings will be spent in non-Indian institutions. Furthermore, the contributions of reservation economic development to State economies and to the Federal treasury can be expected to continue growing.

Can all of this be attributed to the tribally-controlled colleges? No. But in my opinion—and this opinion is based on years of reservation experience—by far the largest part of it can. The tribal colleges have succeeded in creating a positive sum game. The better they do, the better the reservations do, the better the State does, and the better the Federal treasury does.

Senator Conrad, this concludes my testimony.

Thank you.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Sullivan appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much.

Next we will hear from President Joseph McDonald of Salish Kootenai College. I hope that I'm pronouncing that correctly.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH McDONALD, PRESIDENT, SALISH KOOTENAI COLLEGE, BISMARCK, ND

Mr. McDONALD. That is very good. You do a lot better than some of the people in Missoula.

Senator CONRAD. Welcome.

Mr. McDONALD. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for the opportunity to testify, and for having this hearing here where our students, faculty, and Board members can participate and view the legislative process. I commend you for that.

I am to talk about the Carnegie Report. Dr. Boyer could not be here, so I hope to review that for you.

Dr. Ernest Boyer and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching do very outstanding work, and they have completed a report called the Report on Tribal Colleges. We are delighted about the report and the positiveness of the report.

Because they had the Carnegie Foundation do that is great for us. The Carnegie Foundation is the most prominent voice in the Nation in educational research and in reporting. They are sort of like the E.F. Hutton ad, only when Dr. Earnest Boyer talks, the whole field of education stops and listens.

Dr. Boyer got acquainted with the tribal colleges when he was the head of the Department of Education when it was part of the HEW—the Health, Education, and Welfare Department—during the Carter Administration. He helped us by urging President Carter to sign the legislation after Congress passed it.

The Foundation spent well over 2 years with the study—formulating the study, doing the research and doing the writing. The report legitimizes what the tribal colleges are doing and what we say we have been doing. The researchers visited my campus—as they did the other campuses—viewed the classes in progress, met with boards, interviewed students and community members, and they really saw firsthand what is really going on in tribal colleges.

The report announces to the higher education community that tribal colleges deserve to be legitimate members of that higher education family. It announces this to all of them.

We are serving a minority population in our Nation that was previously not reached. I know that you're concerned about the future of the United States. Education forecasters warn us of the huge ground swell forming of an under- educated, unmotivated, permanent underclass. If this ground swell is allowed to grow in the United States, it will endanger the future of our Country economically and socially, because by the year 2000, forecasters tell us that three out of every four jobs is going to take some education beyond high school.

The tribal colleges have all the potential within them to keep the Indian people moving ahead and not being a part of this predicted permanent underclass. We can help the Nation to continue to be a world leader economically, socially, and environmentally.

In the report, Dr. Boyer wrote

> Today 24 higher learning institutions, founded and controlled by Indians, are serving Native communities from Michigan to Washington State. While most of these colleges are no more than a decade old—a blink in time for higher education—they have undergone dramatic growth, expanding and gaining recognition in spite of conditions others would regard as impossible.

The researchers were continually struck with the way that the tribal colleges could cope with very little resources. They found salaries were very low—as our President told us this morning, we take a vow of poverty when we go into the tribal colleges—libraries were terribly underfunded, and administrators struggled daily with financial crises. But it was their finding, despite all of these conditions, that the tribal colleges have not only managed to stay alive, but they have also managed to expand their services and creatively serve the students in their communities.

They found that the very heart of the tribal college movement was the commitment by the Indian people to reclaim their cultural heritage.

Upon completion of the study, the Foundation summarized their findings as follows. First they found that tribal colleges establish a learning environment that encourages participation by, and builds self-confidence in, students who have come to view failure as the norm. Second, tribal colleges celebrate and help sustain the rich Native American traditions. Third, tribal colleges provide essential services that enrich the communities surrounding them. And fourth, the colleges are often centers for research and scholarship.

We just completed our accreditation process last year and got reaccredited for 10 years. In the report, the chairman of the Visitation Committee wrote that she was totally amazed at the amount of research that went on in our college—the economic and social research—that we're doing on behalf of the tribe.

The report made 10 recommendations, and I am just going to go over the two that affect the Federal Government.

The Foundation recommends that the Federal Government adequately support tribal colleges by providing the full funding authorized by Congress, in which you have said that your committee has moved forward to help us attain. Specifically, it recommends that the $5,820 authorized per student be appropriated and that, from this point on, Federal appropriations keep pace so that we don't fall behind. Dr. Sullivan has pointed out that we've fallen behind in this first 10 years.

It urges that the libraries, science laboratories, and classroom facilities at each tribal college be significantly improved through Federal appropriations. It also proposes that Foundations help improve facilities at tribal colleges. And it specifically recommends that the Federal Government appropriate funds for construction so that by the year 2000 every college has an adequate plan to fulfill its educational obligations.

The report recommends that national awareness and advocacy programs for tribal colleges be strengthened.

It goes on to list some other recommendations that will be in the report.

I would like, at this time, to thank you very much. The members of the Higher Education Consortium feel that the report accurately reports what is actually going on with the tribal colleges and the recommendations accurately portray the needs of the college.

Thank you very much for allowing me the time to present this.

[Prepared statement of Mr. McDonald appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much, Mr. McDonald.

May I address the first question to you?

Can you tell me, from your vantage point, what is the single most important contribution that is being made by the tribal colleges to Indian country? If you had to single out something and say that it was the most important thing, what would it be?

Mr. McDONALD. I would say hope because it provides the—regardless of where the student is coming from, whether coming right out of high school, a recovering alcoholic, a new single head of household, a recent widower—it provides them an opportunity to get some education to begin to qualify for these jobs that are going to require the additional training that we see in the future. This gives them that hope.

Senator CONRAD. Can you just briefly tell us, what did the Carnegie Foundation find? What is central to the conclusion that tribal community colleges are very important institutions? If you were to sum up the findings of the Carnegie foundation, what would that be?

Mr. McDONALD. The report said that the heart of the tribal college movement is a commitment by Native Americans to reclaim their cultural heritage. They found out that was really the heart. The cultural eradication that we had which took place in the 19th century is really important to try to reclaim and bring back so that we can have a foundation to go forward from so that we know who we are, and where we came from. We can then practice our culture, have a good positive self-esteem and move forward from there.

Senator CONRAD. Isn't that really the heart of it—my reading of it is—people's views of themselves, if they have self-esteem, feel good about themselves, feel good about their heritage and feel that it is respected, then they are more able to respect themselves and have a better chance of being successful and being productive.

Mr. McDONALD. Yes; very much so.

Senator CONRAD. Mr. Sullivan, would you want to comment on that question? You have a long involvement—

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would agree with Joe, first of all, that hope is the critical thing, and there is a future. But I think that it is also—it is not just the people in the colleges. This change has permeated down through primary and secondary education. Education has become, in fact, something that men and women do. It is not just kind of there.

People that went off to distant schools, even though they succeeded, were not role models because they weren't around. Now what you have are educational role models for little kids. I think that's critical. I would agree completely with Joe that hope is the critical thing if you want to look at the abstract.

Senator CONRAD. Bob, let me ask you, we've had a chance to review the BIA testimony and they say in that testimony that the Tribal Community College Assistance Act was never intended to be the sole source of funds for tribal colleges, what would be your reaction to that?

Mr. SULLIVAN. All I can say is that that is ridiculous. There is no public education institution that starts off with seed money and gradually becomes self-supporting. That is nonsense. If you wanted to look at seed money at all, you might say that tribes have put in a little bit of seed money—what little they had, most of which do

not have any. But the Community College Act—my understanding of it—is that it is identical to what a State would be putting into their system of higher education. It is like State appropriations, but it's from the Federal Government. And we have to have our State appropriation every year, or we would close our doors. You cannot do it all with tuition. You can't collect that much because people don't have it.

Senator CONRAD. So the basic notion—I mean it is a suggestion almost—that we put a Federal infusion in there to get them going. And that's what we've been seeing. We have been seeing a steady decline—a rather sharp decline, as a matter of fact—in Federal support to these institutions to the very part of our society that needs the most help.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, right.

Senator CONRAD. It is really hard to understand.

Let me ask Mr. Shepard, what is the reason that your board has developed such a commitment to these colleges? If you were to sum up, what is the most important thing that the Board feels is occurring at these colleges?

Mr. SHEPARD. I think there was a feeling on the part of the board, as we looked at our work in supporting higher education, that our money was not necessarily providing 10 or 15 years ago as much help for minority education as we would have liked. I think that it's fair to say that within our three State region, the Indian people are the largest minority, and they were not being served very well, as far as we could see.

Regular 4-year institutions were doing their best, but as Bob pointed out, the cultural differences when people came from the reservations and entered these institutions were such that a lot of them did not stay and went back. I guess our feeling is that these tribal colleges provide, probably, the best and most significant assistance in terms of education and an opportunity to break out of the cycle of poverty, along with many other things such as joblessness, that are on the reservations.

By supporting them, we are helping the colleges have an impact on improving the lives of that very significant minority.

Senator CONRAD. Let me ask you a very specific question. The bill that I have introduced would provide $2 for every $1 that would come from a private source up to $10 million of Federal assistance for endowments. In your judgment, would that kind of increase from the Federal Government provide an additional incentive to Foundations?

Mr. SHEPARD. When you use the word "endowment" are you saying that the Federal money would be targeted for an Endowment Fund for each of these colleges, money that would be invested?

Senator CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. SHEPARD. I see.

Well, I think the notion of a matching grant—a two to one match from the Federal Government—as a challenge to private sources is one that usually works. I think Foundations have different attitudes toward Endowment Funds. Many Foundations will say, "We are the endowment. We are not simply in business to transfer our money over to some other institution and let them

invest it." So while the notion is a good one, and probably worth trying, I think it is probably not going to work in every case with every Foundation, but neither does anything else.

Senator CONRAD. All right. Thank you very much.

Any last comment by any member of this panel. We would be happy to have the opportunity for you to express any additional feeling that you may have.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Senator, I would like to reiterate the cruciality of trying to increase the title on appropriation. Without that, even the reauthorized election, it will eventually turn into nothing. The colleges are being penalized for success. The reason the allocation for FT has dropped so far is because the colleges have kept growing and are enrolling more people. The better they do, the less money they get. And finally that comes apart. You can just cut corners, and expect people to work 60 hours a week so long, and then you're dead.

Senator CONRAD. All right.

Mr. Shepard.

Mr. SHEPARD. One short question. You have referred on a couple of occasions to your colleagues on the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs. To the extent that you can speak for them, do your colleagues share your enthusiasm?

Senator CONRAD. I think the fact that the committee reported out full funding for the colleges for this year, $5,820 per student, when they are getting $1,964—that is a threefold increase—speaks volumes about the commitment of my colleagues on the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

I also might add, on a bipartisan basis, that I am very pleased that my colleague Senator McCain from Arizona joined me in a hearing for the overall appropriations for Indian country, and I think it is fair to say that we delivered quite a stern message to the BIA with respect to the request that was made on behalf of Indian country. I do not know what could be more clear as you travel around this State and go to the reservations and see 80 percent to 85 percent unemployment, high levels of alcoholism, and absolute despair, that those communities are in need of additional assistance.

What kind of assistance will pay the greatest dividend? What can do something about breaking this cycle of pain? I think that many of us have concluded that education is the future.

Bob talked about the positive role model and a sense of hope, and a sense that there was a future. My own conviction is that these tribal colleges have been doing more than any other thing that I have seen to break the psychology. When you find something that's working, you ought to put your shoulder to the wheel and try to make certain that they have sufficient resources to get the job done.

The numbers are so dramatic—$3,100 in 1981 per pupil. That would be equivalent to $4,800 today. What are they getting? In 1989 less than $2,000—less than half on a fair comparison basis. And this is the greatest hope that we have for the future. It makes no sense. It makes absolutely no sense.

Somehow we have the money to go take bushel loads of cash over to Japan and pay their military bills, suitcases of money to pay Eu-

rope's military bills, and we don't have enough money to deal with one of the most acute problems that we face here at home. It just doesn't make sense.

Again, I want to thank this panel very much for your contribution.

I will now call the next panel, David Archambault, president, Standing Rock College, and also president, American Indian Higher Education Consortium, Twila Martin-Kekahbah, tribal chairperson, Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas, Edward Lone Fight, tribal chairman of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation, Robert Moore, president, AIHEC Student Congress, and Laurence Gishey, president, Navajo Community College.

I want to welcome this panel. Thank you very much for your attendance and participation here today.

Again, I would ask that you summarize your testimony. Your full written statement will be made a part of the record as if given.

Again, we very much appreciate you being with us today.

We will start with David Archambault, president of Standing Rock College, and president of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium.

STATEMENT OF DAVID ARCHAMBAULT, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM, AND PRESIDENT, STANDING ROCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT. Senator, I want to thank you for making this hearing available at this time. I too, as Joe said, think we have a little temporary reservation here this weekend.

As you can see, this is a big event for AIHEC, and we have wall to wall Indians in about every room here. It's a good feeling. This is a time of a lot of festivities for us, and we have a lot of activities going on, and I'm happy to see that we have the number of people here interested in what is going on here. This process is very important to us and is vital for our future. To understand the political process is vital. I think everybody here is getting a learning experience, as am I. This is the first time that I have ever provided testimony. So, here we go.

Senator CONRAD. You are doing great so far.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT. For the record, I would just like to bring note to some chronology that I think is important to bring out, and that is that there was a report done in 1968 called the Kennedy Report. It was a need to look into the issue of Indian education and the problems that were there. The investigation took place over a couple of years. There were field hearings just like this one, and a lot of testimony was given.

Anyway, overall the investigation of the Kennedy Report came out that Federal policy toward Indian education was a complete failure. It had completely failed in what it was trying to achieve.

Some of the recommendations—it was a very lengthy report with many volumes, and many hours of testimony given—but basically it was recommended that Indians needed creative and innovative programs to address the needs of Indian education.

Another important aspect that came out of it was that Indians should begin controlling their own affairs. Resulting from those

recommendations—there was a lot of other things, but—in 1972 an Indian Education Act came out. That was sponsored, passed, and has done a lot.

I think there is a lot of benefit that we see in Indian country and in Indian schools, and that there are programs that are given now that address the needs of Indian kids in education.

Also the Self Determination Act of 1976 was passed saying that Indian people deserve the right to conduct their own affairs, seek to recognize their needs, and address them. I think culminating from that report—in Congress there was a move showing what Congress would do and allow.

But what I think really came out of this was that we have leaders who have taken lead from there and took a look at needs of Indians on reservations, and that being the need of having a post-secondary education on our reservations.

These leaders, Lionel Bordeaux being one, and we have Carli Minett, there is just several of them here that worked hard at getting a law. I think this is the best law—this Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act—is the best example that Congress has of what Indian people can do if left up to their own to devise what is best for themselves. It was, again, a law that was derived by Indian people, for Indian people, and is affecting and making a lot of successors for Indian people.

In regard to what it has done for us, I can only speak of what I feel is the importance of reauthorizing the Act, and that is in regard to sovereignty. I think as nations we are diverse—we represent several different nations, but we still are very proud of who we are, and this is one of the best vehicles for Indian country, and on reservations, that we have these institutions—part of their mission statement is that they preserve and protect the culture of the nation where they are residing.

With that, in turn, I think again that this is spoken by other people here, and this is that what we are trying to do—we have that in our mission to preserve and protect our culture, but we also want to help the people that are there. Again, in building this strength and pride in our people and then giving them the skills, we then become productive people, and that is nothing more than what we want. That is something that is very important to us. We want to be, in the most way, contributors to the State in which we reside, and contributors to the Federal Government rather than being a drain.

I feel that will be evident. People are starting to realize that this is our intention.

With regard to the reauthorization of the Bill, we do have some heated—not heated discussion, but I guess you might term it that—in which way do we want to go with this in number of years. In November we went with a 2-year simple reauthorization, and then we came back again in February at our Board meeting and spent a lot of time on this and weighed these issues to decide what was best for us. At that time our membership decided to go with a 4-year reauthorization. The reason for that being that we don't have a lot of money, and it is a very expensive proposition to be going into Washington to—I guess this is the term I heard others use—

float this so that everyone becomes aware of it so that it does not get turned down.

We thought that using the 4-year reauthorization would give us more time if we just offered minor amendments, and then we come back to this hearing now and changed to go to the 2 year because we feel that it would be best to align ourselves with the Higher Education Act in 1992. So that's where we are now. In regards to some of the changes that we would like to see in the reauthorization, we are calling them minor technical changes—they are not amendments—just minor technical changes that we feel would be helpful in this 2-year reauthorization.

One of these which is very important to us in section 10, is that our allocation of funds that we do receive is based on our previous year's student count. So, for instance, if I have 250 students at my institution, and I use that figure—that was last year's figure—then I can use that figure to plan for this year. The system that we are in right now—it just does not work. We are trying to get our figures together, and it is changing. We get three payments, one in November, usually one in March, and one in May or June.

We'd like to just use the previous year's count and get it all at once. That's the next change that we'd like to see, if that's possible. If we got all the money up front then we could use that money as we see fit. It seems to me that people think that Indian people can't manage their money. I think the United States Government is probably the most guilty of not being able to watch their budget, yet they always point to the Indian people and say that we can't watch our spending. So that is one of the minor technical changes that we'd like to see.

Again, the 85,820 level is very crucial to us. We have just foregone so many things and cut so many corners, if we were to get that, it would just help us address the backlog of needs that we have. I'm really happy to see that the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs is supporting us with that.

Another thing that we would like to see—there is some colleges that have received some Snyder Act money, and we'd just like to see that language strengthened so that those colleges that have received it in the past can receive it again in the future. Again, anything we can get in these colleges we can use and will spend wisely.

I guess that is the main thing, that we see that this is the best spent money that the Federal Government can spend. For every dollar that we get in—all our budgets represent a finite figure, but then by operating us, we get more money from other sources, so our budgets swell. All that money doesn't come to us, it comes to our students and it helps our reservation economy. So by giving us the small amount of money that we do receive, that is two and three times over generated by our ability to work with the Pell Grant. By operating, we are able to ask for grants from other Federal agencies.

You spoke of endowment—and I really appreciate that you are supporting an increase in endowment, and of course that is very vital to us—so I will not speak to that.

In closing, I would like to say that for my comments, if you ask those questions, I would like to bring up Lionell Bordeaux, and Joe

McDonald to assist me in answering any questions that you might have. I am a fairly new junior member to the AIHEC ranks and these people have been there. They have fought the battles. They know the law. Anything that you would have, I think they could give you much better background, so at that time I would like to call up Lionell Bordeaux and Joe McDonald.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Archambault appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. We welcome them. Please join the witness table.

Next we will hear from Twila Martin-Kekahbah, the Chairperson of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewas.

Welcome Twila.

STATEMENT OF TWILA MARTIN-KEKAHBAH, TRIBAL CHAIRPERSON, TURTLE MOUNTAIN CHIPPEWA TRIBE

Ms. Martin-Kekahbah. Thank you, Senator.

Gentlemen, since fiscal year 1980—the first year for which funds were received by the Turtle Mountain Community College—the college has visibly improved in all areas of operations. Clearly without the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act, there would be no independent tribally controlled community college on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation today.

The Turtle Mountain Community College was founded in 1973 with the philosophy that "higher education for Indian people can best flourish when provided by, for, and of Indian people and that Indian self-determination will result from Indian people so educated with the physical and philosophical matrix of their community". To that end, the underlying goal of the institution is to provide quality education to all people.

In order to provide quality post-secondary education, the Turtle Mountain Community College must have a firmly established, stable funding base for college operations.

Without exception, every tribal college depends on the Tribally Controlled College Assistance Act for its primary source of operational funds.

Also, without exception, every tribal college receives other funds from numerous other sources. Almost to the dollar, these other sources involve Federal dollars, which have restricted, and categorical spending restrictions. In addition, these other programs are sought competitively, are supplemental, are short term, and cannot be used for the general operation of the institution.

All of the tribal colleges would like to reduce their dependency on Federal funds. To that end, the tribal colleges are doing everything possible to raise money from private sources. To be useful, any private money raised should be stable, long term, and with the investment available for the general operation of the institution.

The law provides for the funding of an Endowment Program, but to this date very little funds have been appropriated for this purpose. Last year our tribe awarded the Turtle Mountain Community College $350,000 to apply toward the matching requirement of the law. However, fiscal year 1990 appropriations did not provide for adequate funding. As a result, the match could not be met and our

college is losing out on Endowment interest, money which is essential to their long term financial stability.

We all recognize that one of the most important roles of the tribal colleges is to graduate students who can find employment or transfer to upper division colleges and universities to earn advanced degrees in areas necessary for tribal development. However, our tribal college is taking the lead in two areas that are important to tribal development. The first of these is the contribution they are making to economic development, and the second is the leadership role they are taking in regards to strengthening tribal government. Both of these strengths can be tied into literacy, a tool of empowerment.

The chief function of literacy is to make us masters of the standard instrument of knowledge and communication thereby enabling us to give and receive complex information, orally and in writing, over time and space. Advancing technology requires all of us to use standard written English, and the community colleges are providing that. In today's world, the dreams of tomorrow depend upon true literacy. No modern society can hope to become a just society without a high level of universal literacy. Economics depend on this.

At the Turtle Mountain reservation, we are currently utilizing that form of universal literacy in the areas of the Uniband operation—which is a data processing operation—the Turtle Mountain manufacturing plant, and the medical profession, as well as in providing two year degrees in the area of early childhood as well as other forms of education. That ties into the universal standard of literacy.

Universal literacy is inseparable from democracy. Having the right to vote is meaningless if the citizen is disenfranchised by illiteracy or semi-illiteracy. They are condemned to poverty, powerlessness, and have no capability of comprehension. They do not trust the system.

The civic importance of literacy lies in the fact that true enfranchisement depends upon knowledge, knowledge upon literacy, and literacy upon cultural literacy.

An educational, sociological term I would like President Bush to keep in mind is that of cultural literacy. For the American Indian population on the reservation, we must define what knowledge we want our people to receive and for what purpose.

For example, much has been written within the last year regarding the corruption of tribal government. Whether this is true or not is irrelevant, as I have not yet come across a country, State, or municipality which does not have a degree of corruption. What is relevant to this testimony is what the tribally controlled community colleges are doing in their areas in helping to stabilize tribal government.

For example, our tribal college is the only educational entity on the reservation that has deliberately made tribal government a part of their curriculum. Over the years, through their students, we have witnessed a gradual awareness of the need to have a strong tribal government. The college has taken the responsibility to bring issues before the people in open forums. For example, the college is currently working with the tribal government to put

before the people a revised constitution and by-laws. The new constitution will result in a stronger Government which will help to ensure sovereignty and protection of tribal member rights.

This is called cultural literacy. We cannot have on the reservation literacy alone, but must also have cultural literacy. The community colleges are providing that form.

In conclusion, I feel that the Turtle Mountain Community College has been, and will continue to be, the best investment and the best alternative for our Indian people who desire a college education.

Thank you very much.

[Prepared statement of Ms. Martin-Kekahbah appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much for that excellent testimony.

Next we will hear from Mr. Edward Lone Fight, tribal chairman, Fort Berthold Reservation.

Welcome.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD LONE FIGHT, TRIBAL CHAIRMAN, FORT BERTHOLD INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. LONE FIGHT. Thank you.

[Remarks given in native tongue.]

Dave, I do not know, you said that you were sort of jittery, but I have done these before, and I do not think it gets any easier as you go along because it is very difficult to articulate what the tribal policy ought to be, and to articulate the needs in such a way that you get some direct results. So it is never, in my experience, a real easy situation, but is always a very difficult situation.

Senator, before I begin my talk, I would like to express my appreciation on behalf of the Three Affiliated Tribes for all the wonderful work and the excellent leadership that you are providing the State of North Dakota, including the members of the Three Affiliated Tribes. I appreciate that very much.

I also appreciate the opportunity to express some of the testimony regarding the Tribal College Bill.

In view of time constraints, I would like to summarize my speech. I have a prepared statement that I've submitted for the record.

There are many issues facing the Tribally Controlled Community Colleges, funding, construction, and also the reauthorization of the Act. It was very discouraging to learn that the BIA is opposing the reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act. I view the College Act as one of the primary authorizations for tribal primacy and that in order to exercise and implement the Federal policy of self determination, the tribal colleges are very integral in that effort. In order to do that, we must have trained members that can carry on the services currently provided by the BIA.

I view education as a trust responsibility of the Federal Government and I'm just going to go through some different parts of the speech.

I recommend that $45 million for each fiscal year for the next 5 fiscal years be appropriated for the Community College Act. This is based on the authorized level of 35,800 Indian Student Count, and the projected Indian Student Count would be about 7,580.

We definitely need new facilities at Fort Berthold. Our tribal college is now scattered in about five different store fronts on the main street in New Town. We are looking at construction funds, and I would recommend that money be appropriated at least around $2 million in the construction provision of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act. I also recommend that $70,000 or so be appropriated in the endowment so that money can be used by the tribal college for the operations and to develop such things as faculty development and other needs that the tribal colleges have.

Senator, I support your bill. I hope the rest of your colleagues do the same. I recommend the passage of S. 2213 which you introduced, and also to increase the appropriations to $5 million.

The organization AIHEC has developed some long range goals and objectives which hopefully you will include in your consideration as you go through the bill.

There are many successes at the tribal colleges that I can point to. We have just one that I would like to mention. Eldora Poitra, from Mandari, graduated from Fort Berthold Community College and is now a senior at Mary College, the University of Mary. She was selected to appear in the who's who in American colleges and universities so this is a classic—or a good—example that we can point to and say that this is an individual that perhaps—I know that if a college was not at Fort Berthold, that she would continue to be dependent upon the Welfare and continue the cycle that others have eloquently spoken about here.

This concludes my testimony, and I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Lone Fight appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much, Chairman Lone Fight.

Next we will hear from Robert Moore, president, AIHEC Student Congress. And, as before, when we have completed the testimony of this panel, we will have time for questions.

Welcome.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. MOORE, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN INDIAN HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIUM STUDENT CONGRESS

Mr. MOORE. Thank you. Good afternoon, Senator, Mr. Obey, and Mr. Arnold, it is a pleasure to be here, and I am grateful to be representing the over 10,000 students who attend tribal colleges all across the Nation. As I look out into the audience, I see some of them here and I would like for you to recognize them as well, and to see their faces. If those students that are here at this Senate hearing—this very historic moment for us—would please stand that we might recognize you.

[Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. These are students that, like myself, have been changed, or whose lives are in the process of being changed, because of their experience of going to a tribal college.

In 1986, when I began my experiences at Sinte Gleska College in Rosebud, SD, I found myself going into it very blindly. I had been out of high school for about 6 years and was very much not into that whole role of studying, learning, being with other people, socializing, and all that accompany a higher education experience, as I am sure you are aware.

But with the emotional support of my family, I was able to go on and jump in there. I thought I would go into the college's business program, go through it as quickly as I could, and go on. But whether that meant going on outside the reservation or going on within the reservation, who knew. But I just wanted to get it over with.

During that time, I found it to be very challenging and very exciting to open up a textbook or to hear an instructor give examples of lessons, or to teach us, or to hear our Lakota studies teachers teaching me about something that's very important as an enrolled member of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe, my heritage. That Lakota lifestyle that we have all practiced, that has been practiced for hundreds of years, has become a learning style, and a teaching style for us. Those same values and cultures that are unique to all of the institutions—that is the teaching style, it is that culture.

At any rate, I continued on with my experience there, and I discovered that I was not alone there. There were students there in their twenties, thirties, and we even have a 71 year old student, who are pursuing an education not only for personal benefit, but to see that they become a role model for their family, friends, community, as well as going back to their community to work, to lead, and to be a part of a contributing society that will lead us into the 21st century.

I know this morning, President Archambault gave a talk "1980 state of tribal colleges in the 1990's" and we see ourselves as students carrying that even further into the 21st century as contributors to a society that will one day belong to your children and to my children. I am excited about that.

But perhaps the most significant component of my tribal college experience has been cultural. In every classroom experience, every activity, every community endeavor, anything that the college is involved with, it all focuses back and goes perspectively to the culture that is uniquely Lakota, for us. It continually amazes me that over 100 years ago, somebody with a vision saw somebody like me being able to allow our people to survive. But we have gone beyond survival. We have been going into development of new areas for our people that are no longer survival, but leading us into a group of people, a nation, that is recognized as a successful group of people and a successful nation.

Values like bravery, generosity, fortitude, and wisdom are continually what we look back to in an endeavor that we undertake as an institution. We continue to look back to those values and the important role that those values played for our leaders then, and what they should play for us now, and how we should respect and apply those values to every day life and living for us.

Vision, I believe, is probably being able to see the result before the action is complete. Tribal colleges in the last 20 years have taken action, and as a result I am part of 274 people that graduated, walked across the stage, and received a diploma from a tribal

college, nine of whom were masters degree students going back into the work force contributing not only to the role model and the teaching of Indian students, as these master degree's educators have discovered need to be taught so that our Indian students, at a very young age, have the same opportunity and experiences that we have.

They have broken the mold of maybe 500 years of attitudes of teaching Native American people that I see, and that I have learned about, is that role and that attitude, myself, can never be educated more than being less than the best. But instead we are being educated to be the best at what we do.

I have found that being a part of this group, this 274 people, that their lives were changed just like mine, and there are literally thousands of others whose lives are just like mine, and whose stories and premises are just the same, that their lives have been changed because of their experience at a tribal college.

The American Indian Higher Education Consortium Student Congress is committed to the vision that is tribal colleges. We are committed to seeing that each student that enrolls is ensured of the experience that is borne out of the values unique to each institution. We are committed and dedicated to securing for ourselves recognition for our own civil and student rights, to voice the needs of students being served by the institutions and to ensure the pursuit of self determination by students, and the quality of education which we are receiving.

And last, we wish to enhance the efforts of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, particularly the reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Act today. It is vital that experiences such as we are experiencing now, and that I have experienced, continue. It is so important. The conditions, though, in which they do are extremely adverse. More often than not classes are held in old, abandoned, condemned buildings with classes ranging from the size of 15 to 30 in a room not fit for 6 people. Sometimes it is difficult for us to learn when there are not enough chairs for us to sit in and we have to stand in an already overcrowded room. Or we have to sit at a terminal learning computers and advancing our technological training on the reservations with five people and can only be there for 5 minutes because there are five more people waiting to get to use that same computer. It is outrageous. It is unheard of. It is difficult to learn.

Families suffer. Many of our students begin their day on campus at 8 a.m. and do not get home until 11 p.m. Families suffer. The children suffer from not seeing their parents there, or having to support the work that we have to do in our family structures. Students go hungry. People who live as far away as 50 miles away have to come into the campus, and for the most part, I would say 90 percent of them have very unreliable transportation.

We see the solution as being very easy. As students, we say, "Why don't they build a cafeteria for us? Why isn't there a dormitory for us to stay in?" But we realize and recognize that that is just extremely unaffordable, not only for the institution, but it's unaffordable for us to contribute any more into tuition and fees.

The misconception that we as Indian students are attending tribal colleges for free is just that, a misconception. We have to pay

just like everyone else. Our institutions provide the education, and they provide us the opportunity to go. Maybe we cannot pay right away, but there comes a time for accountability for us as well, to what we receive from our institutions.

Our educational facilities must improve. We need construction dollars for dormitories, for cafeterias, for day care centers especially. Financially, students are strapped. Economic conditions, as I know you are aware, on our reservations often suppress potential students from continuing their education, making it totally unavailable for them because they don't see any other way or any affordable way for them to go. The reality of book bills, tuition, and fees, and the harsh fact of having to put that roof over their heads, or the meal on their table for their families and their children, means a great deal to them. How can they do that?

We are continually asking ourselves, when is the cycle going to end? When can we contribute to the sustenance of our people when affording to educate ourselves is so difficult? How can we do that?

I know that our institutions do the most, and they go beyond what they can afford to provide. However, to meet the need, programs that might have been, never are, or they are so limited to the available resources that they can do no more than those few programs that many colleges offer.

We support the Consortium's request for an increased endowment. This, as a benefit to students, will be available through scholarships, it will certainly enrich curriculum development in current curriculum programs as well as create new programs for ourselves, and it will mean increased degree programs for a lot of our two year institutions. In our doctoral program at Sinte Gleska College, we have students who are going to graduate this year, 11 masters degree students, along with 9 students, who are saying "We're ready for our doctorate." But how can we provide that, or provide the research into developing the program, and the program itself without the endowment dollar.

Finally, and most important, we support the Consortium's efforts to increase the amount, per Indian Student Count, to $5,820. As you have already said, the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs has recommended this. The value of this does not compare with the human resource value that we are offering as graduates, going back into our community, into the grassroots community, building the economic base from which an entire nation will operate.

As institutions continue to forge the paths for us in the areas of agriculture, natural resources, economic development, education, health, and other areas, we as students are going to be developing the framework for which those areas are workable and doable in our communities, and for which those areas we constantly return to our institutions for guidance and direction. As they set the educational tone for those things, teaching us how to go back into our communities and start a farm—how do we develop the land? How do we address health issues which are so poor on our reservations? How do we build an economic base so that we're not always saying "We need $5,820 from you?" How do we do that? I do not know, but our institutions are helping us. The investment in us, for us, will return thousands of times as long as there are tribal colleges.

I am grateful for the opportunity to be here today, and knowing that we as students are a part of the vision of tribal colleges today, encourages us to develop and contribute visions of our own. We've set our own agendas for what we want to do to help our people. So it has increased our determination to succeed in our personal quests, because of our tribal college experiences. Our experiences also validate the existence of tribal colleges. It is wonderful that the Carnegie Report has done so much for us in the area of National recognition, and in areas of possible funding sources outside the Federal Government and in a number of other areas, and how it has validated the existence of tribal colleges to the entire educational world.

Yet we as students and graduates of these colleges are doing that ourselves now. We are the validation for why these tribal colleges exist, and will continue to do so for many years. We are the products of vision, and we are certain that the continued efforts of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, and the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and its Student Congress will enrich and continue to change lives in tribal colleges, and as tribal colleges progress into the 21st century.

I would like to thank you again, and Mr. Obey, and Mr. Arnold, for this opportunity, and that concludes my testimony at this time.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Moore appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much.

And Mr. Gishey, the president of Navajo Community College, welcome.

STATEMENT OF LAURENCE GISHEY, PRESIDENT, NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE, TSAILE, AZ

Mr. GISHEY. Thank you very much.

Senator, and members of the panel, up to this time we have been talking about title I colleges under Public Law 95-471. Navajo Community College is a title II college under Public Law 95-471.

I just want to give you a little overview. I am representing over 200,000 Navajos, growing at a rate of 2.7 percent per year, with a medium age of 18.7 years, with over 250 K-12 schools with an enrollment of 70,000 students, and with 4,500 graduating each year from high school.

While these statistics seem alarming, we do also have issues and problems that we face. We have the highest unemployment rate. As you have already heard earlier, from our other leaders, we experience probably the highest incidence of alcohol and drug abuse, the highest mortality rate, and the list goes on.

As much as I would like to cover all the problems and the issues that face the reservation, we do have some successes. But before I do that, there are four main points that I want the panel here to consider with regard to the Navajo Community College Act.

The College Act was enacted back in 1971, then in 1978 it was amended and put together with Public Law 95-471. During those two amendments, or with the initial act and the amendment, there are two main items that were maintained throughout, and I would like to ask the panel that we would like the NCC Act stay as it is with no changes.

However, the different sections in the NCC Act—there are some points of concern that I would like to have the panel to realize.

I would like to recommend for purposes of construction grants to authorize appropriations which shall provide "such sum as may be necessary". In addition, that the authorization and provisions of construction be made permanent.

Second, for purposes of maintenance and operations grants which are already permanent to continue as is based on "an amount necessary to pay expenses incurred".

I strongly urge that the authorization for construction grants to NCC be made permanent so it will go hand in hand with the maintenance and operations grants. This will allow us to provide, develop, and implement a long range plan for the Navajo Community College.

Third, since no facility study was conducted in 1979, even though it was authorized in 1978 by Public Law 95-471, that the authorization on "Study of Facilities Needs" be retained. This section will provide for "a detailed survey and study of the academic facility needs of Navajo Community College" funds. And as the last amendment stated, that the funds be "drawn from the general appropriations to the Secretary".

Fourth, for purposes of endowments, we support the addition of Title III of Public Law 95-471, which will "increase the Federal contributions to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program". And Senator, I want to thank you for spearheading and introducing that bill.

There has been a lot of discussion here about title I programs. I just want to reemphasize that the seed for control over school was planted somewhere in the southwest in the 1960's. The Navajo Nation started the Navajo Controlled School Boards back in the 1960's. Following, the Navajo Nation also started the Navajo Community College, which all started the Indian college movement. I am very proud to see all these faces in the audience representing all different reservations. What was planted over 21 years ago is now beginning to spread and is beginning to show its impact on some of the things that have plagued the Indian nations for too long.

I just want to bring out a point about construction. Earlier, someone said—Chairman Hopkins, Russell Hopkins—I took it to heart from what he said that Indians have stopped talking, they've put their money where their mouth is. I would like to say that we had a $15 million investment when Navajo Community College was built, and that was completed in 1973. We have used some Federal money, but not 100 percent.

The Navajo Nation invested money and the Board of Regents invested money. To this day, on an annual basis, I pay over $500,000 to my covenants, loans, and bonds. So this gives you an idea that I am strapped with some obligations that I cannot get out of, but at the same time, I have got to worry about expanding our programs and meeting our needs. And the kind of students that we're receiving—their needs are changing. The residents of the reservations are changing.

Further, we have State supported institutions that have set camp outside the boundaries of the Navajo Nation who are after our stu-

dents. As I mentioned, we have a medium age of 18.7, prime material for college recruitment. I am against this competition. They have the odds over me, they are State supported, they have all the resources. I believe that my people should come to Navajo Community College first.

We believe in cultural education. In fact, there will be a day when Navajo Community College will offer its first 4-year program, and that will be in Navajo language, and in Navajo culture.

I just want to say that I appreciate this opportunity. I also encourage all the rest of the AIHEC members that I hope we can stand together, and that we will continue to forge forward in Indian education. I think our time has come to provide that leadership. The presidents are all providing that.

I thank you very much, Senator.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Gishey appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much.

Let me first turn to Chairperson Twila Martin-Kekahbah, and ask this question, what are the differences that you see on reservations that have a tribal community college and those that do not? What are the differences in the dynamics on the reservation, from your observation?

Ms. Martin-Kekahbah. The reservations I have visited, in reference to community colleges, you can see a definite difference with the economics, but more critical in my mind is the stability they provide to tribal government. I think in the past the history that we have been taught is that—tribal government is not important or critical, to self-determination. The BIA continualy used tribal officials as a means of trying to rubber stamp the Bureau's philosophy but I believe the community colleges have brought forward the true meaning of what a stable tribal government means to self-determination.

Without a tribal government there are no BIA schools, there are no IHS hospitals, there are no—other services that are provided. We are not without the tribal government sovereign. So, I see the colleges as providing that stability. Again, they've done it through forums, culturally related curriculum, and by providing the right type of leadership that we all know we need.

Senator CONRAD. All right. Thank you very much.

Chairman Lone Fight, if we were successful in getting my doubling of the endowment from $5 million to $10 million and we provided that two for one match of Federal dollars to every dollar that we could attract in the private sector, would that help, in your judgment, attract additional private funds?

Mr. LONE FIGHT. Senator, yes. To kind of piggy back from what President Gishey was talking about, I think, as an example, at Fort Berthold Community College we are going through a construction phase. The planning and design stage has been completed. We are now forging ahead to actually turn some dirt and construct the first phase of the Fort Berthold Community College Program.

To give you an example, we have secured—first of all our need is about $1.97 million for phase 1—we have secured $173,200 from the Library Service Construction Act. We have secured $44,000 from the Otto Bremmer Foundation, and also the tribe has contributed through the docket moneys, $120,000, and also in a kind gift of

land from the Industrial Development Corporation of $30,000, and $20,000 was donated by the Three Affiliated Tribes for the acquisition of land, which brings a total of $387,200. We also secured $25,000 from the MacArthur Foundation. With fund raising, that brings the total amount to $412,200. We still need a balance of $684,800.

From that kind of a backdrop it would definitely be more than a shot in the arm. I think it would make the new college a reality.

Senator CONRAD. All right. Thank you very much.

Let me ask President Archambault, you said that the colleges' allocation should be based on the previous years student population. How is that allocation made now?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT. Right now it is based off our student count, but we start school, and then they consider what that student count is. So, we are going into school, and we really don't know—

Senator CONRAD. You do not have the money to match the students, is that it?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT. Right. We are given money, we start up school, and we are operating for 2 or 3 months, and then the money comes later on. So we have a deficit operation there. So it creates a lot of strain. I know the first time when I first got there, we had to borrow money because the Congress was tied up in its budget process and that money did not come to us until December, and we just simply did not have the reserves to pay our employees. We were fortunate that our Tribe was able to sign a loan for us, and we received $50,000 and we were able to pay our payroll. But if they had not done that, then we would have had a pretty blue Christmas.

Senator CONRAD. Thank you very much.

In the interest of time—I have additional questions, but we are getting close to the end of our hearing period, and I want to make sure that we have a chance to hear from Ed Parisian, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian Education, and to have time for questions as well.

So I would like to thank this panel very much. Your testimony has been excellent. You've made a significant contribution to the work of the Committee, and we very much appreciate that.

We will now call on Mr. Edward Parisian, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Indian Education Programs of the BIA.

Welcome, Mr. Parisian. It is very good to have you here.

I want to welcome your associate as well.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD PARISIAN, DEPUTY TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY, INDIAN AFFAIRS; DIRECTOR, INDIAN EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ACCOMPANIED BY DON MCCABE, OFFICE OF INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. PARISIAN. I would like to introduce Mr. Don McCabe. He is with the Office of Indian Education. He works in the higher education area. He will be providing some answers to some specific questions, although he will not be making a statement.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Parisian appears in appendix.]

Senator CONRAD. All right.

You have had a chance to hear the testimony here this morning, and the testimony, I think, is very articulately delivered, and really very overwhelming in its persuasiveness as to the role of tribal community colleges and the very positive contributions that are being made by them. Could you give us the view of the agency on the role of tribal community colleges and on the kind of contribution that they are making?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes; first of all, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

As far as S. 2167 is concerned—and I heard this in earlier testimony that the Bureau did not support this—the Bureau strongly supports the enactment of S. 2167, just for clarification, section I and section II. So we do support that and, as I said, we strongly support that issue.

I am not going to go ahead and read this statement, because I have provided that for the record and would like to have time for questions.

As far as S. 2213, I would like to say that we cannot support the enactment of that bill. This bill would increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program and would change the current 50/50 cost sharing arrangement to a two to one Federal/non-Federal cost share. We support the 50/50 cost share and we believe the $5 million authorization level is sufficient for fiscal year 1991. However, we do intend to consider the changes suggested in S. 2213 in the context of the fiscal year 1992 budget process.

Senator CONRAD. Let us talk about that 1 minute here, because we have a difference of opinion, obviously, on the need for increasing the endowment. We have heard the testimony here today. We know that these colleges are operating on half the Federal contribution that they received in 1981. We have cut them in half, and the overwhelming testimony is that this is one of the most positive things occurring on the reservations. This is about the only thing that's providing hope out there, and a chance to break this cycle of poverty, and you come and tell us that we ought not to increase the endowment. How do you justify that?

Mr. PARISIAN. I justify that by saying that we do support—we do not say we do not support the endowment, we say that we support the 50/50 or the one to one match. We just don't support the two to one match that is in your bill.

We also—

Senator CONRAD. You are not supporting an increase in the endowment?

Mr. PARISIAN. We are supporting what is in the current authorization which is $5 million.

Senator CONRAD. $5 million. You are not supporting the increase to $10 million? You are opposing the increase?

Mr. PARISIAN. That is correct.

Senator CONRAD. I am asking you, how can you justify that given the overwhelming testimony we have heard here this morning on the value of what is occurring at these colleges and the fact that their funding has been cut in half over the last 9 years? How can you come and take that position?

Mr. PARISIAN. It is my understanding that with the authorization of $5 million in the current bill, and the proposed authorization of $5 million in the next reauthorization, that even over the last 3 years, actual appropriations amounted to $1.2 million approximately, so they have not appropriated up to the amount that was fully authorized at this point yet. So we support continuing that authorization up to the $5 million amount.

Senator CONRAD. Let me say to you, that the way that you send a signal to Congress that there is a need, is for you folks to come in there and lay it on the table, and say, "Look, this is working. This is working. This is something we should support. If we want to break this cycle of poverty, this is what needs to be supported." And when you come in and say, "No, just don't do any increase there," the signal that you send is, "Just keep on doing what you're doing." And I would urge you to go back, after hearing the testimony that we've heard today, and say to your colleagues at the Bureau, "You know, maybe we shouldn't be talking about rethinking this in 1992, maybe we should think about changing our position now."

Let me ask you, Mr. Parisian, I understand that before you joined the Bureau, you served on the governing board of the Stone Child Community College in Montana. Is that correct?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes; that is correct.

Senator CONRAD. And when you were in that position, did you support increasing the Federal endowment contribution? [Laughter.]

[Applause.]

Senator CONRAD. Let us let him answer.

Mr. PARISIAN. Well, when I was in that position, sir, I did support a 2 to 1 match.

Senator CONRAD. So you had a very good position at that time, would you say? [Laughter.]

Mr. PARISIAN. I would hope that they are both good positions. [Laughter.]

I would take that recommendation back and look at that consideration, but at this time we are supporting the $5 million authorization.

Senator CONRAD. And opposing an increase?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes.

Senator CONRAD. And that is at variance with your own previous position?

Mr. PARISIAN. In my other life, yes. [Laughter.]

Senator CONRAD. Well, I hope you go back to the position you had in your previous life, that was a better position.

I do not raise that for the purposes of embarrassing anyone, but I do raise it because when you were in that position you saw very clearly the need, I think. And I think you took a very principled position, and a very honest position, that those institutions deserve more support. If we're going to make some difference in Indian country, we have got to fight for it. And what is happening out there now, is just unacceptable. I am sure that would be your position. Am I wrong? Do you see the need for more resources for these community colleges?

Mr. PARISIAN. As I said, we strongly support the community colleges. I see the need for the community colleges, and what's happening in Indian Country, as well as the positive reinforcement that's happening from Indian colleges, but at this point, we're just supporting the reauthorization of S. 2167, which has in it the 50/50 match.

Senator CONRAD. Let me ask you this, do you support the increase in the per student funding that has been called for by the Select Committee on Indian Affairs?

Mr. PARISIAN. At this point, we support the dollars that were recommended in the fiscal year 1991 budget. We are currently looking at increasing those dollars in the fiscal year 1992 budget. What we have done is found that that is one of the needs that have come up, not just from the hearings that we have been at, but from the many summits that we have had over the past two months. That post-secondary education is in need for increased dollars as far as per student count has been one of the priorities has come up, particularly from the mini-summit that we had in Rapid City in the north. We are considering that and looking at that for the fiscal year 1992 budget process.

Senator CONRAD. I really have to say to you, I do not understand the delay. We know the need. There is no need for any more delay, studies, or hearings. The fact is that these tribal colleges have been cut in half over the past 9 years—cut in half. All of the testimony, and in my own experience—I have seen it with my own eyes what is happening with these community colleges. They are the most positive thing going on on the reservations in my State to break this incredible cycle. I hear you saying that BIA is stuck on last year. When do we advance the ball? When do we make some progress?

Mr. PARISIAN. As I said earlier, sir, we are taking that under consideration for the fiscal year 1992 budget process.

Senator CONRAD. That is my question. Why do we have to wait for fiscal year 1992? You have been around the country, you have had the hearings, you know the numbers just as well as I do. These colleges have been cut in half in 9 years. Why should we wait for a recommendation from all of you until fiscal year 1992? In your previous life, you saw the need.

Mr. PARISIAN. It is the Bureau's position that we support what was asked for in the Administration's budget in fiscal year 1991.

Senator CONRAD. All right. Let me ask you this way. Are you aware that, with respect to the endowment provisions of the Act, that the black colleges can receive more than a one to one match?

Mr. PARISIAN. No; I am not.

Senator CONRAD. Well, if you became aware of that, would you then see the justification for allowing the schools in Indian country to receive more than a one to one match?

Mr. PARISIAN. I will check into that, review that, and make a recommendation based upon that knowledge.

Senator CONRAD. Let me ask it this way. Is there any reason why we should not provide at least as much, in terms of a match, to tribal colleges as we provide to black colleges?

Mr. PARISIAN. Again, not knowing what—

Senator CONRAD. No; just as a principle, without knowing. Just as a principle.

Mr. PARISIAN. Again, I would just have to say that we feel that what's in the budget, the $5 million is sufficient for fiscal year 1991.

Senator CONRAD. You do not want to answer the question on principle, I take it?

Mr. PARISIAN. I support the administration's fiscal year 1991 budget request.

Senator CONRAD. Let me ask it to you this way, the President has proposed tripling Federal Government's contribution to the endowment of the black colleges, and I hear you testifying on behalf of the President that we just keep the Indian colleges the same. You are opposed to an increase. How do you justify that position?

Mr. PARISIAN. If the President is supporting tripling the black colleges, I would hope that he would also support tripling the Indian colleges—

Senator CONRAD. But he is not. You are testifying on behalf of the President today. Is that right?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes; and that is why we support the $5 million that is in the fiscal year 1991 budget.

Senator CONRAD. And you are opposing an increase for Indian colleges, but he has called for a tripling of the support to black colleges. Could you explain that to us?

Mr. PARISIAN. No; I cannot, because I am not sure of his reasoning for the increase in the black colleges.

Senator CONRAD. Would it be the Bureau's testimony that the colleges could effectively use additional support?

Mr. PARISIAN. In what way?

Senator CONRAD. Would it be the Bureau's testimony that if Congress was able to find additional support, working with the President, if we were able to find additional resources for the colleges, that they could use them effectively?

Mr. PARISIAN. I feel, given the situation that the tribal community colleges are in that it would be beneficial for us to support that, yes.

Senator CONRAD. All right. I appreciate that.

Could you just give us, on a more general basis, your view of what role the tribal community colleges are playing in these communities?

Mr. PARISIAN. I think that they are playing a very important role in the communities. I think you had asked the question earlier of the chairman from Turtle Mountain. I think that they're making education more available to the students that are there on the reservations, you can see that they have more of an opportunity and a chance to use the community colleges to begin education.

I think you are seeing also something that was not mentioned earlier, that you are seeing more students in the elementary and secondary levels survive, as far as the drop out rates being less. I just feel that they are being successful at that local level, as far as education is concerned, across the board.

Senator CONRAD. Let me ask you another question. Haskell, of course is an institution which is BIA operated, is that correct?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes; it is.

Senator CONRAD. And if one looks into the total support at Haskell, which is the BIA-run institution, is it true that their per student support from the Bureau exceeds the support received by tribal colleges?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes; it is.

Senator CONRAD. Why the difference?

Mr. PARISIAN. If I understand the numbers correctly, I believe Haskell receives approximately $6,000 per student. Theirs is done on an enrollment basis. I believe the difference is because at Haskell you have dormitories, and you have food service program over and above the academic programs. At tribal community colleges, it's more to run the academic programs that we have.

Senator CONRAD. I just make the point that at the BIA-run institution there is a level of support of $6,000 per student, and these other institutions are at less than $2,000. We are at $2,000, at Haskell you are at $6,000. It would seem to me that, that should tell us that there is a need for additional support.

Let me ask, what is the total budget for Haskell, do you know?

Mr. PARISIAN. The total budget for Haskell for fiscal year 1990 is $8.67 million?

Senator CONRAD. What percentage of that is Federal?

Mr. PARISIAN. 100 percent.

Senator CONRAD. 100 percent?

Mr. PARISIAN. Yes.

Senator CONRAD. And you make the point that Federal funds were not intended to cover all costs of tribal colleges, but they're covering all of the costs at Haskell. How do we justify that difference?

Mr. PARISIAN. The point that was made in the testimony, sir, was that it wasn't intended for the full amount. Again, it goes back to—the way I understand the situation, being in this position for the last 2 months—is that it was intended to be the base support, and that there would be other areas, such as endowments, foundations, and tuition costs to pick up additional costs as happens with State run colleges and other universities in the system.

Senator CONRAD. But how do you justify this difference? Haskell is getting $6,000 per student, 100 percent Federal, and the tribal colleges are getting $2,000 and you're saying that they shouldn't expect to get all their money from the Federal Government. How do you justify this difference? It seems like we have a contradiction here.

Mr. PARISIAN. I agree with that, and I'm not sure just how to justify it. I would have to take that back and check into that.

Senator CONRAD. I would appreciate it if you would do that. I very much appreciate your testimony that the Bureau supports the reauthorization. That's important. I would urge you to go back and say to the folks at the Bureau, "Why is it that the Administration is tripling the endowment for black colleges and our position is no increase for the Indian colleges when they have been cut in half over the past 9 years?" That question needs to be answered.

The second question that needs to be answered is, how do we possibly justify a position by the Bureau that we keep these Indian tribal colleges at $2,000 per student, which is half of the level that they had 9 years ago, when we see the need, and we see what

they're doing—the positive difference that they're making. Why are we saying that the Bureau should wait until fiscal year 1992 to start closing this gap?

I would ask you to take those questions back and see if we cannot get an answer. I will tell you, there is such a crying need out there, and the Bureau needs to take leadership. The Bureau needs to stand up and fight for what is legitimately needed—not one penny more than what is legitimately needed—but there is, in my judgment, an affirmative obligation to ask for what is legitimately needed. If you will do that, I would appreciate it.

Any last comment?

Mr. PARISIAN. Sir, I appreciate the opportunity to be able to provide this testimony.

Thank you.

Senator CONRAD. Thank you. And with that we will close the hearing, and thank all who have participated here today. We appreciate your help.

[Whereupon, the committee was adjourned to reconvene at the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

Additional Material Submitted for the Record

The Bush Foundation, established by Mr. and Mrs. Archibald Granville Bush of Saint Paul, Minnesota, was incorporated February 24, 1953, under the Minnesota Nonprofit Corporation Act, to encourage and promote charitable, scientific, literary, and educational efforts. It is a tax-exempt organization under the laws of Minnesota and the United States. Mr. Bush was one of the founders of the 3M Company. The Foundation has concentrated its grantmaking in the areas of education, humanities and the arts, social welfare, health, and leadership development. Geographically, the Foundation's grants are principally in Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. The income available to the Foundation represents the investment yield from assets given the Foundation by Archibald and Edyth Bush. The Foundation's assets are roughly $400 million. Its annual grants appropriation is just under $20 million.

In April, 1977, the Foundation granted $100,000 to construct a library at Sinte Gleska College on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota. This was the first grant by the Foundation to a tribally-controlled college located on an Indian reservation enrolling prisarily Indian students. Since that time, the Foundation has granted over $1.5 million to eight fully accredited colleges of this kind located in the western half of the United States. (In 1987, the Foundation Board decided to extend eligibility to accredited tribal colleges outside the Dakotas.)

Bush support for tribally controlled colleges is now aimed at fully-accredited institutions located anywhere in the U.S. So far, these have included:

Blackfeet Community College, Browning, Montana
Fort Berthold Community College, New Town, North Dakota
Navajo Community College, Tsaile, Arizona
Oglala Lakota College, Kyle, South Dakota
Salish Kootenai Community College, Pablo, Montana
Sinte Gleska College Center, Rosebud, South Dakota
Standing Rock Community College, Fort Yates, North Dakota
Turtle Mountain Community College, Inc., Belcourt, North Dakota

Since 1983, the majority of Bush support for tribally-controlled colleges has been used for faculty development. Most of these colleges are geographically isolated, their operating budgets are tight, and opportunities are scarce for faculty members to attend professional meetings, engage in graduate study, or work on improving the curriculum or teaching techniques. Bush money has supported these types of activities. With some variation depending on the number of full-time faculty, Bush grants for this purpose have generally averaged $25,000 annually for each college. During 1989,

$260,000 was appropriated for faculty development activities in these institutions.

During this past year, Bush money was used both for group activities as well as for small grants to individual faculty. At Salish Kootenai College, part of the Bush grant supported faculty attendance at a three-day conference with tribal elders designed to improve faculty understanding and sensitivity for the local culture and heritage. At Standing Rock College, a group of faculty attended a conference in Grand Forks on different approaches to student testing. A Turtle Mountain Community College instructor enrolled during the summer in a course on tribal natural resource management at the University of Colorado. He subsequently incorporated information on Indian water rights into his own course on Federal Indian Policy and Tribal Government.

Some Bush grants in the Dakotas also have supported capital projects. For example, after student enrollment had increased to over 1,000 students at Oglala Lakota College in South Dakota, a Bush grant of $225,000 helped to support the construction of a new classroom building in the small town of Kyle. Because of the large size of the Pine Ridge Reservation, instruction at Oglala Lakota College is offered in nine separate locations.

In June, 1989, the Foundation also granted $218,000 to North Dakota State University in Fargo for a program designed to increase Indian student enrollment in North Dakota's six public universities, particularly for transfer students who will have completed two years of study at a tribally-controlled college. Each year during the summer, five faculty members from public four-year universities in North Dakota and five faculty from tribally-controlled colleges will team-teach for one month on two of the reservation campuses. In addition, four faculty from tribally-controlled colleges in the state will engage in faculty development activities or enroll in graduate programs at two of the public universities. Bush money will underwrite stipends and living expenses for the faculty participants. Program administrators expect that after two years, if the program is successful, the public universities will support continuation of this project.

Bush support for tribally-controlled colleges is based on the belief by the Foundation's Directors and staff that these institutions provide educational services which are not available to Indian people anywhere else. Students can live on reservations and attend classes on a full or part-time basis as they choose. Both academic-counseling and career-counseling services are available at the tribal colleges. Statistics appear to support the claim that attendance at a tribal college assists students to break out of the cycle of joblessness, poverty, and substance-abuse which affect so many reservation residents.

It strikes me as I visit these tribal colleges that they operate on bare-bones budgets, not only with respect to meeting program costs, but also with regard to providing adequate physical facilities. They clearly need more support in both these areas.

Robert Sullivan
Director, Special Projects
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58105

Senator Conrad, other members of the committee, distinguished guests. My name is Robert Sullivan and I am Director of Special Projects at North Dakota State University. I would like to thank the members of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs for the opportunity to testify on behalf of the reauthorization of the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act.

I will address three topics: First, what the twenty-four tribally-controlled colleges have meant to their respective reservations; second, the impact of the tribally-controlled colleges on Indian post-secondary education and how they relate to state systems of higher education; third, the impact of the colleges on reservation economic development and, as a consequence, the economies of their states.

My remarks on these topics are based on twenty years of experience working with the eighteen Indian reservations in the two Dakotas and Montana in the area of economic and community planning and development, and with the tribally-controlled colleges and AIHEC from their inception.

What the Colleges Have Meant

The establishment of the tribally-controlled colleges is, in

my opinion, the most significant event to occur in the Indian world since the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act. The 1934 Act focused on insuring Indian sovereignty and self-government -- or to speak in broader terms, Indian self-determination. The Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 offered the Indian people their first major opportunity to transform self-determination from a philosophical notion that everybody agreed with, to an operating reality. In effect, the Act represented the federal government's recognition and support of some ten years of widespread Indian efforts to establish an Indian-controlled system of post-secondary education designed to meet Indian needs.

The impact of the twenty-four tribally-controlled colleges on their respective reservations has amply demonstrated the wisdom of that 1978 legislative initiative. It would be hard to identify any federal legislation or expenditure, Indian or otherwise, where the benefits have so completely overshadowed the costs. Put simply, federal support of the tribally-controlled college movement may well be the most important Indian investment the government has ever made.

The specific impact of the tribally-controlled colleges on Indian post-secondary education and on economic development will be reviewed further on. The interest here is in their broader impact on reservation Indian life. Three outcomes are worth noting:

1. The success of the tribal colleges conclusively demonstrated the efficacy and power of self-

determination. Indian leaders had long been aware of the importance of post-secondary education to their tribal futures; but they had also been aware of the inability of outside institutions to provide this. They sought the opportunity to design their own system, i.e., the opportunity for self-determination. They conclusively proved that given that opportunity, they could do it very well indeed. Witness the fact that all but five of the tribally-controlled colleges are either fully accredited or in various stages of candidacy for full accreditation -- and the remainder soon will be.

2. The tribal colleges have been a primary factor in tribal revitalization on their respective reservations. They are directly responsible for the rekindling of hope and pride among the Indian people. They are a symbol of a better future.

3. The tribal colleges have had a major impact on the quality of life on their respective reservations. They are the leaders in a process of cultural and historic revival. The success of the colleges has strengthened the entire reservation educational system. Likewise, tribal college leaders are playing advisory roles in every area of reservation development. And finally, tribal college graduates are moving into leadership positions within their tribes.

Their Impact on Indian Post-Secondary Education

It is only a slight exaggeration to say that reservation Indian post-secondary education actually began with the tribal colleges. To be sure, some reservation Indian people sought post-secondary education at outside institutions in earlier years. But lack of money, family obligations, cultural alienation and other barriers greatly limited their number. And even among the few who enrolled in those outside institutions, the combination of culture shock and inadequate primary and secondary preparation meant that even fewer were successful.

The advent of the tribal colleges changed this situation

dramatically. The colleges brought post-secondary education to the reservations. They provided opportunities to people who were either unable or very reluctant to go elsewhere. They provided an Indian context for the educational process. And they also provided not only personalized attention, but the comprehensive remedial work their enrollees needed to overcome their inadequate earlier schooling.

The results have been striking. Not only are the tribal colleges now enrolling approximately five thousand Indian people (many of whom first earned General Equivalency Diplomas), they are graduating seven to eight hundred annually. The majority graduate with two year associate degrees, but a substantial number graduate from Sinte Gleska and Oglala Lakota with bachelors degrees (and Sinte Gleska is also accredited for the Master's in Education). But perhaps the most impressive statistic is that nearly thirty percent of the students receiving associate degrees or vocational certificates from their tribal colleges go on to pursue more advanced, specialized degrees at outside institutions. And unlike past times, the great majority of these tribal college graduates who transfer to an outside institution following their work at a tribal college are successful in obtaining a four year or more advanced degree.

What happens to all of these tribal college graduates after the completion of their post-secondary education? An overwhelming majority are fully employed, either on their reservation or elsewhere. Indeed, unemployment rates among the

tribal college graduates, associate, certificate or four year degree, average only fifteen percent -- and even the fifteen percent is made up predominantly of people who have just completed their education. This employment outcome speaks for itself when it is compared with overall reservation unemployment rates ranging from fifty to eighty-five percent.

Furthermore, the production of degreed graduates is only part of the tribal colleges' role in Indian post-secondary education. The colleges are also very active in providing supplemental courses and training for the Indian population across the reservations, supplemental training which is often linked to improving the individual's employment situation. Likewise, they have been directly responsible for the development and implementation of training programs in connection with reservation economic development (about which more will be said further on). In other words, to repeat what was said earlier, the tribal colleges have had a major impact on every aspect of reservation life.

The relationship between the tribal colleges and the state systems of higher education in their respective states appears to be excellent. I can testify directly to this fact with respect to the two Dakotas and Montana. And I have no information which indicates that the situation is any different in those other states where tribal colleges are located. The state institutions in the Dakotas and Montana, including the graduate institutions, have a variety of linkages with the tribal colleges. Among other

things, arrangements have been developed between the tribal colleges and the state institutions which permit the full articulation of tribal college courses and programs with those of two and four year state institutions. Likewise, joint efforts are going forward currently to develop specialized two year associate curriculums in, for example, pre-engineering and pre-business, degrees that will enable associate degree graduates of the tribal colleges to transfer into the professional programs at the universities with no loss of time, i.e., at the junior level. Likewise, here in North Dakota, the state system is in the process of implementing a unique faculty exchange program with the four North Dakota tribal colleges.

More examples of the relationships between the tribal colleges and state institutions could be offered: Montana and Montana State universities have a number of very close linkages with the various tribal colleges in Montana. But since time is limited, I would simply like to state that speaking from the standpoint of the state system of higher education, I believe that the tribal colleges have proved to be the critical link that was needed to ensure that the Indian people have the opportunity to take advantage of the public system of higher education in the United States. I can also state that my opinion is shared by university colleagues (note the attached letter from President Jim Ozbun of NDSU) and the Commissioner's Office in the North Dakota system of higher education.

Their Impact on Reservation and State Economic Development

The tribal colleges have likewise become a key player in the economic development process on their respective reservations. Clearly, it would be impossible to overestimate the importance of their continuing role in developing a well trained and educated reservation work force. Over the last twenty years the reservations where tribal colleges are in place have become much more attractive as potential locations for outside concerns. They have likewise witnessed indigenous manufacturing development, e.g., at the Turtle Mountain and Fort Peck Indian Reservations. This is not to say that economic development has become easy for the "tribal college reservations;" they still suffer the disadvantages inherent in remote locations. But a better educated work force and the presence of a tribal college able to provide specialized work force training as needed has substantially enhanced their economic development opportunities.

At the same time, it should be noted that the tribal colleges' contribution to reservation economic development is not limited to improving the quality of the overall reservation work force or the provision of specialized training in connection with specific new reservation enterprises. The colleges have also provide many of their local people with the education and training they need to improve their employment situation, their income, and the quality of their lives. Two year programs in business and middle level management have enabled local Indian small business people to improve their operations, and they have

enabled other Indian persons to establish small business enterprises. Curriculums in land management and farming and ranching have made very substantial contributions to improving the economies of the Plains reservations. In a number of instances, the tribal colleges have taken lead roles in enhancing the local economy, e.g., Standing Rock Community College, whose agricultural curriculums and proactive stance have had a major impact on the local farming and ranching economy. In other instances, the colleges have spearheaded efforts to develop new types of economic enterprises. The Blackfeet Community College, for example, is working closely with the tribal leadership to assume the management and further development of what is currently a federally funded Indian museum in Browning, Montana, with the expected outcome being to substantially enhance tribal income from Glacier Park tourism. Or again, the Fort Peck Community College is leading a tribal effort to develop a major facility for the commercial production of mushrooms. In short, the colleges have become very important providers of technical assistance and leadership to their tribes in areas ranging from economic planning to the analysis of potential tribal ventures. Many of the tribal college presidents in this room today are active members of their respective tribes' economic development committees.

What does this mean to for the economies of the states, or, for that matter, the federal economy? Reservation economic development contributes directly to the economies of their

respective states and to the federal treasury. Indian people who are working are paying taxes; they are not receiving welfare. Indian people who are working are likewise contributing directly to the economies of their states, since the majority of their earnings will be spent in non-Indian institutions. Furthermore, the contributions of reservation economic development to state economies and to the federal treasury can be expected to continue growing.

Can all of this be attributed to the tribally-controlled colleges? No. But in my opinion, and this opinion is based on years of reservation experience, by far the largest part of it can. The tribal colleges have succeeded in creating a positive sum game. The better they do, the better the reservations do, the better the state does, and the better the federal treasury does.

Senator Conrad, this concludes my testimony. Thank you.

NDSU

North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58105-5687
701-237-7011

April 6, 1990

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to express my regrets that it will not be possible for me to attend the Ninth Annual American Indian Higher Education Consortium Conference. I had intended on being there, but the budget and planning issues facing higher education in North Dakota at the present time have made it impossible for me to attend.

My visit to the community colleges across the state have convinced me that these institutions play an important role in the higher education system in North Dakota. We will do what we can at NDSU to cooperate with the community colleges in achieving their goals. Further, we are committed to making NDSU a positive experience for our Native American students.

Best wishes for a most successful conference.

Sincerely yours,

J. L. Ozbun
President

cj

DR. JOE MCDONALD
PRESIDENT SALISH KOOTENAI COLLEGE
AT BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA

Thank you very much for providing members of AIHEC to provide testimony to you on the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978. As you know the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching did an extensive study of the tribal colleges over a two year period. The Foundation reported its findings in a Special Report entitled: TRIBAL COLLEGES,SHAPING THE FUTURE OF NATIVE AMERICA.

Dr. Ernest Boyer wrote: "Today twenty four higher learning institutions, founded and controlled by Indians, are serving Native communities from Michigan to Washington State. While most of these colleges are no more than a decade old-a blink in time for higher education they have undergone dramatic growth, expanding and gaining recognition in spite of conditions others would regard as impossible."

The Foundation researchers were continually struck by the capacity of tribal colleges to cope with resources they felt were, "painfully restricted". They found salaries far too low, libraries that were terribly underfunded, and administrators struggling in daily financial crises that other higher learning institutions would totally reject.

They found that many of the colleges were housed in mismatched trailers and unsuitable buildings converted from other uses after being virtually condemned. It was their finding that despite all of these difficult conditions, the tribal colleges have not only managed to stay alive, but they also expanded their services and "creatively serve their students and their communities".

The Report stated that the tribal colleges are truly community institutions. "After years of brutal physical hardship and disorienting cultural loss, Native Americans--through the tribal college movement - are building new communities based on shared traditions."

The problems of extreme poverty, high unemployment, rampant alcoholism, poor health conditions, and high infant mortality are crises the tribal colleges are trying to help solve by providing leadership, programs, and resources to meet the challenge.

The researchers for the Foundation found that the heart of the tribal college movement is a commitment by Native Americans to reclaim their cultural heritage. Some tribes have lost much of their tradition and feel an urgency to reclaim all they can from the past as they confront the problems of the present. They went on to write: "...Indians are determined to reaffirm their heritage, and tribal colleges, through their curriculum and campus climate, are places of great promise".

Upon completion of the two year study of the tribal colleges, the Foundation summarized their findings as follows:
First, tribal colleges establish a learning environment that encourages participation by and builds self confidence in students who have come to view failure as the norm.
Second, tribal colleges celebrate and help sustain the rich Native American Traditions.
Third, tribal colleges provide essential services that enrich the communities surrounding them.
Fourth, the colleges are often centers for research and scholarship.

The Report discusses the place for traditional culture in higher education, the enrollment trends, the characteristics of the students, the governance, the faculty, physical facilities and builds a need for funding. It discusses the important role the tribal colleges play in their local communities by helping in the areas of native culture, health care, and economic development.

Ten recommendations are made to help maintain and improve the tribal colleges.

1. The Foundation recommends that the federal government adequately support tribal colleges by providing the full funding authorized by Congress. Specifically, it recommends that the $5,820 authorized per student be appropriated and that, from this point on, federal appropriations keep pace with the growth of Indian student enrollment.

2. It urges that the libraries, science laboratories, and classroom facilities at tribal colleges be significantly improved through federal government appropriations. It also proposes that foundations help improve facilities at tribal colleges. Specifically, it recommends that the federal government appropriate funds for construction as authorized in the Tribally Controlled Community College Act so that, by the year 2000, every college has an adequate plan to fulfill its educational obligations.

3. The Report urges that connections between tribal colleges and non-Indian higher education be strengthened. Specifically, it recommends that four year institution work with tribal colleges for the transfer of credit and the development of cooperative degree payments.

4. It recommends that programs linking tribal colleges to their communities be significantly increased.

5. It recommends that Tribal colleges expand their important role of preserving the languages, history, and cultures of the tribes.

6. It is recommended that state governments more adequately support tribal colleges. The Report urges especially that the states target funds for community service programs

7. The Foundation felt that the establishment of a comprehensive program for faculty development at the tribal colleges is very important.

8. Other Foundations are encouraged to collaboratively support the Tribal College Institute, which is designed to strengthen administrative leadership in Native American higher education.

9. The Report recommends that the national awareness and advocacy programs for tribal colleges be strengthened. Specifically, it recommends that private philanthropies collaborate to provide, for three years, support for a Washington, D.C. office with a full time director.

10. The final recommendation is that the newly established tribal college endowment (The American Indian College Fund) be supported to increase the fiscal base and bring long term stability to the tribal colleges.

Senators, the members of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium feel that the Report accurately reports what is going on with the Tribal Colleges, and that the recommendations accurately portray the needs of the College. We sincerely hope that we can count on the help of this Committee and of Congress to help carry out the recommendations.

Thank you very much for allowing me to present this information on the Carnegie Special Report entitled Tribal Colleges,Shaping the Future of Native America.

DAVID ARCHAMBAULT
AIHEC PRESIDENT, and
PRESIDENT, STANDING ROCK COMMUNITY COLLEGE

On behalf of the 22 member Colleges of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium which are supported by Titles I and II of "The Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Assistance Act," we extend our appreciation to the United States Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs for this opportunity to express our views regarding the reauthorization of this Act. This testimony will limit itself to addressing Title I of the Act. Our AIHEC colleague, Navajo Community College, will present their views on Title II.

Before speaking to the specifics of reauthorization issues, I would like to first point out for the record some relevant background and successes of the tribal colleges. It is our opinion that "The Tribally Controlled Community Colleges Assistance Act" is one of the most powerful success stories in Indian country today. Although this statute has been implemented for just a decade, insufficient time to fully measure all the far-reaching social and economic impacts, it has nevertheless some extraordinary accomplishments to its infant history.

It is our contention that the tribal colleges are one of the wisest investments of federal dollars. When first enacted in 1978, only 12 tribal colleges existed. The original number of full time equivalency Indian students was 1,600. By 1990, this number had expanded to 22 tribal colleges and a 4,945 full-time equivalency (FTE) student count. (In actuality, over 20,000 students attend the nation's 22 tribal colleges ranging from full to part-time enrollments, but for purposes of the allocation formula, these counts are reduced to full-time equivalencies).

For this growth to have occurred within a hardship environment of inadequate responsiveness from the federal trustee (the Bureau of Indian Affairs), inadequate facilities and meager appropriations which eventually averaged less than half that available per student to AIHEC's colleague public institutions, attests to a tremendous educational void that existed, and which these colleges came into existence to fill.

Among those who have earned degrees or taken their skills straight attending the tribal colleges, the unemployment rate is 17% - 21% accurately dramatically with a national reservation unemployment rate that ranges from 35% to as high as 81%.

In a 1990 sample survey of AIHEC institutions, which earned an graduates ranged from $8,000 to about $22,000 annually. In most instances, these individuals can be expected to contribute to the tax base at an estimated $750 per individual and social security at $1,530 per individual. Further, the survey documents that upward of 70% of all entering tribal college students had to be given remedial assistance prior to attending these colleges. For some of the tribal colleges, 90% to 100% of entering students fared this first academic course prior to matriculation.

It appears that not only does the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act" provide a wise investment of federal dollars, in many instances it justifies an active redirection of federal dollars as regards tribal college beneficiaries who are no longer welfare bound. Endowed with appropriate educational opportunities, tribal college students can and do become contributors within our nations economy. However small this contribution may be, they are

Of the 27 tribal colleges, 11 are fully accredited. Two offer four year degrees, Oglala Lakota College, serving the Oglala Sioux Reservation, and Sinte Gleska College, serving the Rosebud Sioux Reservation, both of South Dakota. This year, Sinte Gleska College graduated the first class of nine Masters degrees in Education. The other 25 tribal colleges offer two year degrees at the Associate level. For many Indian students, these colleges are the bridge to continuing their education at dominant society educational institutions. Of the tribal colleges surveyed, 24% of their students have gone on to attend other mainstream colleges. In many instances these same students would not have succeeded had they begun their post-secondary experience by directly entering mainstream institutions. The college environment close to home enables a supportive environment where students can learn within their own cultures and move at their own pace. Many students require remedial and support services that would simply not be available to them in the larger, dominant society institutions. In some tribes served by the colleges as many as 75% to 90% of the enrollment speak their native language. The bilingual part of the enrollment poses quite native language. The bilingual part of the enrollment poses quite native language. The bilingual part of the enrollment poses quite

There are still many other far-reaching contributions of the tribal colleges to their reservation communities beyond curriculum and employability considerations. Due to the isolated location of most of the reservations, the tribal colleges serve as a center for many tribal services. Most tribal colleges offer CED, ABE and community outreach programs as resources permit which are inaccessible [illegible] because of distance, poverty, winters and inadequate roads. Tribal college health education offerings have a significant impact on entire reservations, where for some the incidence of diabetes among adults is as high as 70%, and alcoholism as high as 40%. Some tribal colleges conduct health screening clinics for the public. Some operate alcohol abuse and drug awareness programs for their communities and schools, as well as science fairs and career guidance programs to connect with elementary and secondary schools. Many offer non-partisan voter education and citizen awareness programs. As just one example, through its Student Government, St. Bellknap College increased voter registration from 215 to 827 over four years. Some provide parenting courses and child day care; many outreach to senior citizens. Many hold leadership training and other specialized workshops and seminars on one example, training an entire unit of the Soil Conservation Service on database. Nearly all are focal points for better appreciation of cultural activities and preservation. And nearly all offer major library resources to the reservation public. At least one tribal [illegible] to the reservation through the College Public Television. And all of the 32 tribal colleges enable their students to feel a greater sense of self-worth and self-esteem through their college achievements.

While the aforementioned data and examples are not exhaustive, they are fully representative. Hopefully, these substantiate the many positive contributions of these colleges to their communities, universal [illegible] and other services, and speaks to the critical need for the reauthorization of the "Tribally Controlled Community College Act." I would now like to speak to the many unmet needs of the tribal colleges as relates to our continuing requests for amendments to the reauthorization.

The original Act allows for a per student authorization of $3,000, with the level has never been realized through appropriations, to be [illegible] needed. The average inflation factor of the location of most of the colleges increases nearly all costs. Utility costs are generally at between 12 and 20% higher on reservations than in [illegible]. Costs all services, shipping and delivery are at every level of cost. Travel costs for purchasing or [illegible] are extremely expensive to [illegible] programming. Economic adversely affects tribal college employees, who pay higher costs of gasoline at limited nearby [illegible], or pay high costs of distance travel and time to [illegible] vendors. Employee [illegible] have increased [illegible] costs documented as high as an additional $2,000 to $3,000 per year. Our tribal college personnel average salaries that range between 25% and 30% lower than their public institution counterparts. Their fringe benefits are similarly less, in some instances, to the extent. If tribal colleges are to continue to [illegible] a goal of educational excellence and equal educational opportunity for their students, the authorized level of per student funding must [illegible] keep [illegible] of living that goal.

It is our further recommendation that the overall level of authorization for the Act be increased to $45 Million. This is necessary because, should the per Indian student count level of funding become realized, and we remain dedicated toward this goal, then considering the modest growth in annual enrollments, this increase is justified. The colleges have averaged up to 14% annual growth in past years, and in view of the population indicators, enrollment growth seem assured. This request simply seeks that equal educational opportunity be available to students in tribal colleges as that which is available to mainstream America.

Although AIHEC has consistently endorsed the need for forward funding, it has never been realized. Indian education programs are to my knowledge the only educational programs which find themselves frequently well into an academic year without knowing what their budgets for that year will be. It seems that this problem may not be remedied through the authorizing statute, but since it is so paramount I wish to point out for the record the severe negative impact it has on planning and operations for the colleges.

AIHEC recommends that the allocation per Title I college should be based on the previous year's Indian Student Count average; further, that the enrollment average of 127 per year shall be established as the maximum increase in per college allocation, over the previous year allocation. This is intended toward minimizing the negative effects on all colleges, particularly the small colleges, if an unanticipated tremendous increase in enrollment should occur at any one college, as has occured in past years.

Finally, under distributions of operations, AIHEC recommends that funds distribution be provided to Title I colleges at 100% or as close outside of each Fiscal Year. Delays in BIA Administrative disbursements, and errors in their disbursement calculations, can create havoc for tribal college operations even after the final Fiscal Year appropriation level is known. The colleges have more than established a responsible track record in administering tribal college funds, and believe this request is fully justified.

Under Planning, AIHEC recommends that appropriations earmarked for new colleges planning, such that an amount equal to 5% of the Title I Section 107a appropriation shall be the maximum available for new college funding, and if not expended, shall be reallocated equitable to existing Title I colleges.

We urge that the reauthorization contain provisions that will protect, seek to and strengthen funding stability for colleges which receive funds through the Tribal Act, which are in addition to funds authorized through the Indian Colleges Act. It should be ensured that tribal colleges will be continued to any and the receipt of Student Aid funds. To date those colleges include: Fort Berthold Community College, Turtle Mountain College, Oglala Lakota College, Salish Kootenai College, and Stone Child College.

Tribal colleges need for facilities and construction has been well-documented. Most colleges began in deteriorated or abandoned government facilities, and most have never had adequate repair or maintenance since inception. Some pose serious health and safety problems, such as the presence of asbestos in two colleges. Most need simple basic repairs, and without attention these deteriorating conditions are only exacerbated over time. Immediate needs are more than modest, such as a fence and insulation for one college day care area, and upgraded furnaces and roofs for others.

AIHEC urges the Committee to strengthen these facilities and construction provisions. Under facilities we recommend that the appropriation authorization be set at $10 Million per year. Under new construction, we recommend that the appropriation authorization be set at $12.5 Million per year, with a 4 to 1 ratio match from each college, and a ceiling of $400,000 be established as the maximum required college contribution.

Finally, under the Endowment provisions of the Act, we commend the introduction of S.2513, a Bill to increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program. The need for increased endowments has been well-substantiated by all colleges, and likewise the severe limitations among the colleges to raise substantial private matching resources. This amendment would ease the hardship and greatly enhance the colleges ability to realize a potentially more significant impact from the interest it yields. We urge its enactment.

AIHEC also recommends that the Committee amend the Endowment provisions to include real estate and deferred giving as an allowable non-Federal match. The date for registering matching resources with the BIA should be set at the last month, or quarter, of the fiscal year in order to maximize the benefits of the provision. Further, the provision that funds under the Endowment remain available until expended should be clarified and strengthened to ensure that no latitude exists for BIA misinterpretation, and subsequent termination of the availability of these endowment funds at the close of any fiscal year. Finally, the provision should expand the definition of allowable expenditures to ensure that interest income may be expended in accordance with the role and mission of the respective college.

In summation, there are problems with the implementation of this statute for which our years of deliberations will yield no proposed solutions. These problems center around a history wherein, despite well-documented needs and the authorization allowances of the Act, the AIHEC colleges continue to receive a per student level of funding at approximately half that provided to our sister public institutions. Our federal benefactor, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, continues in what appears to be the performance of their secondary responsibility role, and year after year requests funding from the Congress at levels that would eliminate tribal college offerings at less than half that provided to the rest of the nation's postsecondary institutions. While this dilemma seems to be outside the auspices of an authorizing statute, we felt it important with starting it for the record, in the hope that it will be an avenue right to travel through the authorizing process which would help note, and and expand educational opportunity to American Indian students in tribal colleges through full assistance

TESTIMONY ON REAUTHORIZATION OF THE
"TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978" AS AMENDED

SUBMITTED BY
TURTLE MOUNTAIN CHIPPEWA TRIBE
TWILA MARTIN-KEKAHBAH, CHAIRPERSON
BELCOURT, NORTH DAKOTA 58316

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee. My name is Twila Martin-Kekahbah. I am Tribal Chairperson of the Turtle Mountain Chippewa Indians. I thank the committee for this opportunity to share my belief that the "Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act" should be reauthorized. Since FY 1980, the first year for which funds were received by the Turtle Mountain Community College, the college has visibly improved in all areas of operations. Clearly without the "Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act, there would be no independent Tribally Controlled College on the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation today.

The Turtle Mountain Community College was founded in 1973 with the philosophy that "higher education for Indian people can best flourish when provided by, for and of Indian people and that Indian self-determination will result from Indian people so educated within the physical and philosophical matrix of their community". To that end, the underlying goal of the institution is to provide quality education to all people.

ACCREDITATION

Foreseeing reauthorization of the act, North Central Association of Schools and Colleges, after a thorough on-site review of the institution, granted continued accreditation to the college in July 1989.

To illustrate the importance of P.L. 95-471 to the accreditation process, let me quote the Report of a Visit document submitted by North Central Association following its 1980 visit, "with the funding of the Indian Community College Act a reasonable secure

source of revenue can be provided". Without a doubt, a firmly established funding base will influence the Accrediting Associations determination as to whether the Turtle Mountain Community College will maintain continued Accreditation in the years to come. In order to provide quality post secondary education the Turtle Mountain Community College must have a firmly established stable funding base for college operations.

The reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled College Assistance Act is essential to the continued growth of Turtle Mountain Community College. The law authorized "grants for the operation and improvement of Tribally Controlled Community Colleges to insure continued and expanded educational opportunities for Indian students, and to allow for the improvement and expansion of the physical resources of such institutions".

The Act should provide more than "seed" money. This interpretation was not the intent of congress,however the Bureau of Indian Affairs has not accepted the legislation as a critical part of their education programs and has never requested adequate funding levels. Reauthorization should address this issue.

Using documents which have been furnished to Congress by the BIA showing the complete financial status of each Tribal College; the BIA has concluded that the Tribal Colleges are receiving mega-bucks from "other " sources and that, because of this, the funds available per ISC are more than adequate.

Without exception, every Tribal College depends on the Tribally Controlled College Assistance Act for its primary source of operational funds.

Also, without exception, every Tribal College receives "other" funds from numerous other sources. Almost to the dollar, these other sources involve federal dollars, which have restricted and categorical spending restrictions. In addition, these "other" programs are sought "competitively", and are "supplemental", are short term, and cannot be used for the general operation of the institution.

All of the Tribal Colleges would like to reduce their dependency on Federal funds. To that end, the Tribal Colleges are doing everything possible to raise money from private sources. To be useful, any private money raised should be stable, long term, with the investment available for the general operation of the institution. The law provides for the funding of an endowment program, but to date very little funds have been appropriated for this purpose. Last year our tribe awarded Turtle Mountain Community College $350,000 to apply towards the matching requirement of the law. However, FY 1990 appropriations did not provide for adequate funding. As a result, the match could not be met and our college is losing out on Endowment interest money which is essential to their long term financial stability.

It takes money to raise money, and if the fund raising initiatives of the colleges are to be taken seriously, then a multi-year investment would be required. At present, the colleges do not have these types of financial resources available to them.

Our students, particularly our graduates, continue to demonstrate success. Each of these successful students represent an individual insurance policy against unemployment and virtually assures than one more American Indian will become an effective and contributing citizen of the American democracy. If one compares all of the Federal Funds spent on Indian reservations and Indian programs over the past several decades and compares that figure to the Federal funds spent on Tribal Colleges and then compares the genuine success of these programs, it becomes clear that the Tribal Colleges are the most cost effective programs on Indian reservations today.

We all recognize that one of the most important roles of the Tribal Colleges is to graduate students who can find employment or transfer to upper division colleges and universities to earn advanced degrees in areas necessary for tribal development. However, our Tribal College is taking the lead in two areas that are important to tribal development. The first of these is the contribution they are making to economic development and the second is the leadership role they are taking in regards to strengthening tribal government.

In the area of economic development, the college is making three main contributions. The first is the natural impact in economic dollars that are being generated because the college is owned and operated by the tribe. These are new dollars that only a few years ago were not in circulation within the reservation economy. Secondly, the college has taken the initiative to assist tribal members with the establishment of Indian owned business. The college has formed what is perhaps the first tribally based business organization whose membership is entirely locally owned Indian businesses. The third contribution involves the training of tribal members to assume employment with private industry. For example, the college has trained welders and machinists for the tribally owned manufacturing plant and they have trained data entry technicians for the tribally owned Data Entry Corporation. Both of these are examples of the college identifying the employment needs of the reservation and responding by developing training programs to satisfy those needs.

Our tribal college is the only educational entity on the reservation that has deliberately made tribal government a part of their curriculum. Over the years, through their students, we have witnessed a gradual awareness of the need to have a strong tribal government. The college has taken the responsibility to bring issues before the people in open forums. For example, the college is currently working with the tribal government to put before the people a revised constitution and by-laws. The new constitution will result in a stronger government which will help to ensure sovereignty and protection of tribal member rights.

In conclusion, I feel that the Turtle Mountain Community College has been and will continue to be the best investment, the best alternative, for our Indian people who desire a college education.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, this concludes my testimony. Your attention is greatly appreciated. Migwetch.

TESTIMONY OF CHAIRMAN EDWARD LONE FIGHT
BEFORE THE
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee thank you for this opportunity to provide this testimony. My name is Edward Lone Fight, I am the Tribal Chairman of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation.

We at Fort Berthold have made gigantic strides in recent years in providing the opportunity of post secondary education to members of the Three Affiliated Tribes as well as to all members of the surrounding non-Indian communities. While the growth of services provided by the Fort Berthold Community College was in direct response to community need and interest it has not been able to grow in proportion to that need. The Fort Berthold Community College has not had the financial resources to expand to keep pace with the community demand for more services and the increased enrollments.

Currently the College is housed in six scattered store fronts in the city of New Town, ND. The spring enrollment is 185 students which represents both full and part time students and due to lack of space some of the classes had to be cut.

By this testimony I am requesting your assistance in the following six areas:

1. A reauthorization of the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, as amended;

   We are seeking reauthorization of the act for a period of 5

years, which would provide the college with financial stability as it prepares for its continued accreditation. The next accreditation visit is scheduled for March 1991.

2. Appropriation levels for 1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1995;

An appropriation level should be established at $45,000,000 each year for the next five fiscal years. This dollar amount is based on $5,800/Indian Student Count (ISC) x projected ISC's of 7,580 reflecting approximately a 12% annual growth rate in ISC per tribal college.

3. Construction/Facilities Section in the Act;

Facilities are badly needed at Fort Berthold Community College. Appropriation which meets the minimum standards to construct adequate facilities is absolutely necessary. Fort Berthold Community College has documented construction needs at $2.6 million dollars. The development of adequate facilities will take several years to complete therefore, in anticipation of this, and in keeping with the Carnegie recommendations, a ten-year financial effort to construct and improve physical facilities should be initiated by Congress. However, in the short term, several tribal colleges face immediate and serious problems with deteriorating buildings. At this time an amount of at least $2,000,000 should be immediately appropriated.

The tribal college consortium developed a priority and ranking system for meeting construction needs, the following priority/ranking system for construction was developed by the tribal colleges:

A. Emergency repairs

B. Emergency renovation and acquisition

C. Construction by accredited institutions with documented facilities development plans. (Fort Berthold Community College has these plans)

D. Planning fees for accredited institutions, and

E. Planning fees for non-accredited institutions.

4. Endowment for Tribal Colleges;

Since the initial endowment appropriation, Fort Berthold Community College has developed an endowment fund of $70,000. The Tribe and Fort Berthold Community College supports S.2213, the bill would increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program recently introduced by Senator Kent Conrad. The increase from $5,000,000 (current appropriation is $500,000) to an annual appropriation of $10,000,000 would significantly increase the college's endowment, to meet capital expansion and program needs.

S. 2213 which provides for a Federal match on a 2:1 ratio can be matched by the tribal colleges if the endowment match includes real estate and deferred giving as a match.

Since the release of the Carnegie Report on Tribal Colleges, responses from private funding sources have been positive. As endowments are developed, the greater and more stable the sources of income to the colleges become.

5. Long Range Goals of the College;

Long Range goals of the college are to:

- Develop a central campus for the college as a resource in all areas
- Assist the Tribe
- Develop the necessary curriculum to match 21st Century technology needs and meet the human needs of all members of the communities of Fort Berthold
- Preserve the Three Tribes cultures and traditions by instituting relevant curriculum.

6. Future Perspective;

Fort Berthold Community College is one of the fastest growing institutions on the Fort Berthold Indian Reservation. In its history the college has graduated a total of 135 graduates. Over 55 percent of the graduates have gone on to four year baccalaureate programs. Their success rate at the four year colleges has ben phenomenal. An example of the successful graduates is the story of Eldora Poitra. Eldora is a graduate of Fort Berthold Community College who went on to the University of Mary in Bismarck. She was named to Who's Who In American Colleges & Universities by the University of Mary. Eldora has been on the Deans List since enrolling at the University of Mary.

The college will continue to develop into a quality college providing quality programs of study for the small community of Fort Berthold.

This concludes my testimony, I will be happy to respond to any questions you may have. Thank you.

TESTIMONY

OF

NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE
REQUESTING THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE
NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT

Presented to
Senator Kent Conrad, Chairing the United States
Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs
Field Hearing April 9, 1990
Bismarck, ND

Presented by

Laurence Gishey, President
Navajo Community College
Tsaile, Arizon 86556

On behalf of the students, faculty, staff and members of the Board of Regents at Navajo Community College (NCC), I express my sincere appreciation to the United States Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs for the opportunity to request the reauthorization of the Navajo Community College Act. As you know, the NCC Act is Part II to P.L. 95-471. As such, I asking this Panel to reauthorize the NCC Act as it stands with no change.

I am recommending to the Panel:

1) For purposes of contruction grants to authorize appropriations which shall provide any "such sum as may be necessary". In addition, that the authorization and provisions of contruction grants be made permanent.

2) For purposes of maintenance and operations grants which are already permanent authorizations to continue as is based on "an amount necessary to pay expenses incurred".

I strongly urge that the authorization for construction grants to NCC be made permanent so it will be consistent with grants for maintenance and operations, thus allowing the College to develop and implement long range planning for facilities and programs simultaneously.

3) Since no facility study was conducted in 1979 even though it was authorized by P.L. 95-471 in 1978, that the authorization on "Study of Facilities Needs" be retained. This section will provide for "a detailed survey and study of the academic facility needs of Navajo Community College" funds for which are to be "be drawn from general appropriations to the Secretary".

4) For purposes of endowments, support the addition of Title III of P.L. 95-471 which will "increase the Federal contributions to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program". Senator Kent Conrad, you are to be commended for introducing this bill (S2213) which holds guaranteed benefits for future generations.

In view of the four items I have presented, I cannot overemphasize the importance of full appropriations for the authorized provisions in the NCC Act. Navajo students have nothing left to look forward to except education because they can no longer earn a decent living from farming and livestock. Their only chance is education and they can obtain this most valuable commodity at Navajo Community College.

NCC is playing a key role in the socioeconomic development of the Navajo Nation. It trains and educates students who are transferring to four year institutions and who are gaining direct employment. It has become the change agent for more than 200,000 Navajo people whose annual birth rate is 2.7% and with a median age of 18.7 years. Among the Navajo people there are nearly 250 K-12 schools serving some 70,000 students, of which 4,500 graduate from high school each year. Notwithstanding its greatest human resource

potential the Navajo Nation still lags behind the American mainstream in living standards, education, health care, housing, employment and economic development. Only through education can these negative trends be reversed.

Navajo Community College is the first Indian controlled College in the United States which was established in 1968. The College opened its doors almost exactly one hundred years after formal education had first been imposed on the Navajo people. The Navajos' initial resistance to compulsory education had become supplanted during this hundred year period by demands for appropriate and quality education, a change of attitude that was accelerated by World War II which heavily involved Navajo people in the armed forces and the defense industry.

The new College opened classes in January 1969 in a Bureau of Indian Affairs high school facility in Many Farms, Arizona which it shared with the high school program for the next three and one-half years. The Office of Economic Opportunity funded the initial three years of operation, with additional support from the Donner Foundation, other private agencies and the Navajo Tribe. In July 1969, Dr. Ned Hatathli became the first Navajo President of the College and the Board selected the Tsaile-Wheatfields area as the permanent site for the College. In order to meet the long-term goals of the College, funding was sought from the Federal Government, resulting in the passage of the Navajo Community College Act, Public Law 92-189, in December 1971. This law provided for basic operational funding for College programs with funds to be channeled through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Construction began on the new Tsaile Campus in 1971.

In October 1978, the United States Congress passed and President Carter signed the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act, Public Law 95-471, which authorized the funding of College operations and facilities construction for NCC and other tribally-controlled community colleges, replacing the earlier legislation.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has recently (December 1989) released a study of the tribally controlled colleges, [illegible] of Native Americans (Princeton University Press, 1989), in which it cites two "false assumptions" behind the historical "mis-education" of the Indian people: That they could be removed from their culture without harm - and must be removed for their own progress; and that the dominant society could accomplish this goal through education (p. 39). After over one hundred years (in the Navajo case) of attempted cultural genocide under government policies shaped by such thinking, and supported by a new federal policy of Indian self-determination inaugurated during the Nixon presidency, tribes are now taking more control of their own destinies. In the view of the Carnegie study, in this new era in which tribes are taking more control of their own development, tribal colleges should be the means of tribal empowerment.

Navajo Community College is the only postsecondary academic institution based on the Navajo Reservation. The Navajo Tribe supports a sister vocational training institution, the Crownpoint Institute of Technology, which is located in Crownpoint, New Mexico. The Reservation encompasses some 25,000 square miles situated in north-eastern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico and southeastern Utah - an area frequently compared in size to the state of West Virginia. It is the largest Indian reservation in the United States, located on the high Colorado Plateau. The topography is distinguished by a diversity ranging from flat, dry barren plains through strinkingly beautiful red sandstone canyons and buttes to high mesas and forested mountains. This land traditionally sustained the Navajo as a pastoral and horicultural people, noted for their skills in weaving and silversmithing. While these pursuits continue to contribute to the economy of the Navajo Nation, rapid population growth and sociocultural changes have brought recognition to tribal leaders that diversification and expansion of the economy, supported by development of a skilled labor force, is essential for sustaining the Navajo people into the future.

The Navajo Nation along with other Indian nations is striving to move from a status which has been described as analogous to that of a third world nation, as a "colony" of the United States (The Navajo Nation: An American Colony, A Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1975), to a self-directed nation rooted in its own culture and guided by its own vision. It faces many of the problems confronting other emerging nations - poverty, a relatively unskilled labor force, growing population and the lack of capital for economic development. Navajo Community College, as its institution of higher learning, provides one instrument for addressing the nation's self-perceived needs. Ernest C. Boyer, in his Foreword to the Carnegie report on tribal colleges, vocies the need to support this movement for Indian self-determination.

> To the extent that we fail to assist Native American, through their own institutions, to reclaim their past and secure their future, we are compounding the costly errors of the past.

The educational programs of the College are consistent with the Mission Statement which specifically provides for the College to offer two-year transfer programs, vocational and technical training, Dine Studies, Development Studies, research projects and consultancies, continuing education programs and coordination of higher education programs on the Navajo Nation.

The mission of Navajo Community College is guided by an educational philosophy that is based in Navajo culture and tradition. The central concept of Navajo philosophy places human life in harmony with the natural world and the universe.

The Dine (Navajo) Philosophy of Learning, derived from the sacred origin story of the Navajo people, establishes the state of harmony (hozho) as the ultimate goal of Navajo learning.

NCC has produced a number of successful students. Two have become medical doctors and one has chosen to serve his people in a remote area of the reservation; another has earned his Ph. D. and is now the Superintendent of a reservation public school district; four have held the prestigious title of Miss Navajo, two of whom have won the Miss Indian America title; and another has acquired his CPA and established a successful accounting firm. There are a number of others who are working in leadership positions within the public and private sectors on the reservation and across the country.

The institution as a whole is also making progress: The North Central Accreditation Association's Site Visitation Team has recently concluded its evaluation of the College with a recommendation for continued accreditation; the Navajo Language Program has added 300 and 400 level courses for certified teacher instruction; three articulation agreements hav been signed with four-year institutions which will provide a smooth transition for our graduates; and the College will become a regional testing center for Navajo Language by providing an alternative to the foreign language requirement for students attending four-year institutions.

Yet, in spite of these successes, the College still faces funding uncertainties, cutbacks, unexpected emergencies and changing student needs. Buildings are starting to settle underlining the need for major repair and renovation. New construction, especially for the Community Campus is a pressing need.

The total needs of students and reservation residents are changing. There are growing numbers of single-parents and married students with dependents who are in need of appropriate college housing. There are large numbers of students who are academically deficient who need basic programs, prior to the start of their college career. There are also growing numbers of handicapped students who are being denied access and opportunities due to the physical barriers at Tsaile and at the community campuses.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Panel, I respectfully request that you support the re-authorization of the Navajo Community College Act and to make Section A like Section B a permanent authorization.

In closing, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to you Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Panel. I assure you, once educated, our young men and women will become contributing and resourceful members of society.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD PARISIAN, DEPUTY TO THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY - INDIAN AFFAIRS/DIRECTOR (INDIAN EDUCATION), DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BEFORE THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS, U. S. SENATE, FIELD HEARING IN BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA, ON S. 2167, "TO REAUTHORIZE THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1978 AND THE NAVAJO COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT"; AND S. 2213, "TO INCREASE THE FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION TO THE TRIBALLY CONTROLLED COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENDOWMENT PROGRAM."

April 9, 1990

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here to present the views of the Department of the Interior on S. 2167, a bill "To reauthorize the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 and the Navajo Community College Act"; and S. 2213, a bill "To increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program." I will discuss the bills in that order.

S. 2167

We strongly support the enactment of S. 2167. Section 1 of the bill authorizes appropriations for grants to tribally controlled community colleges for two additional years, through FY 1992, by amending the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1810(a)). This section also authorizes appropriations for the endowment program for tribally controlled community colleges through FY 1992 by amending the 1978 Act (25 U.S.C. 1836). Section 2 of S. 2167 reauthorizes appropriations for the Navajo Community College through 1992 by amending the Navajo Community College Act (25 U.S.C. 640c-1).

The Bureau of Indian Affairs provides grants under these two Acts to 22 tribally controlled colleges for academic and administrative purposes and for the operation and maintenance of the colleges. Each college is governed by a local board of regents,

a majority of whom are Indian. Most of the colleges are on Indian reservations making them accessible to the Indian students. In addition, the environment and atmosphere of the colleges are familiar to the students. Because of cultural differences and language barriers, dropout rates of Indians at traditional institutions of higher education have been high. However, the retention rate at the tribally controlled community colleges is 89.23 percent, the drop-out rate is 10.77 percent.

The 23 tribally controlled colleges are located in 10 midwestern and western states. Twenty of the colleges are located on reservations. The colleges are sponsored by 36 Indian tribes. During the 1988-1989 academic term, the colleges enrolled 16,787 Indian students and 4,208 non-Indian students, for a total of 20,995 students. During the academic year, the colleges awarded 192 one-year certificates, 427 AA/AAS degrees, and 35 BA/BS/MA degrees. The age of the students range from 16 to 85 years. The composition of the student body is 5,964 males and 10,823 females for the Indian students, and 1,320 males and 2,888 females for the non-Indians. These colleges play an important role in the education of individual Indians and in the development of Indian tribal governments.

S. 2213

We cannot support the enactment of S. 2213. This bill would increase the Federal contribution to the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program and would change the current fifty-fifty cost-sharing arrangement to a two-to-one Federal/non-Federal cost-share. We support the fifty-fifty cost-share and believe the $5 million authorization level is sufficient for FY 1991. However, we do intend to consider the

changes suggested in S. 2213 in the context of the FY 1992 budget process.

The purpose of the Tribally Controlled Community College Endowment Program, established under the Act, is to provide grants for the encouragement of endowment funds for the operation and improvement of tribally controlled community colleges. Under this provision, each college that receives an endowment program grant is required to match the grant on a one-to-one basis. The endowment grant and the matching portion must be invested in a financial institution insured by an agency of the Federal Government, or in Federal securities. Only the interest earned from the endowment fund investment may be used to defray the expenditures associated with the college.

The Bureau has maintained that the grants provided to the colleges under Title I of the Act were never intended to pay the full operating cost of the institutions and that the colleges were expected to find other sources of revenue such as foundations, philanthropic organizations, corporate entities, federal and state grants, tuition charges, etc. The Title III endowment program is ideally suited for this purpose. Technical assistance is being provided by the Bureau to the colleges in the areas of proposal writing and grantsmanship. In addition, the names of publications and other materials that list foundations, philanthropic organizations, and corporations that provide funding for Indian programs have been identified for the TCCCs. Considering the budget needs of the colleges, an endowment fund of, for example, $500,000 to $1 million invested at current interest rates would generate approximately $40,000 - $80,000 in annual interest income.

The endowment program authorized under that Act provided $5 million for each of Fiscal years 1988, 1989, and 1990. The $1,250,000 appropriated for the endowment programs for the past 3 fiscal years has been matched dollar-for-dollar by non-Federal sources.

This concludes my prepared statement. I will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

28-940 O - 90 - 4

WRITTEN TESTIMONY

Submitted to the:

U.S. Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs

Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman

Honorable Kent Conrad, Field Chairman

1990 American Indian Higher Education Consortium Conference
April 9-11, 1990
Bismarck, North Dakota

-Fiscal Year 1991 Interior Appropriations-

Submitted on behalf of:

Sinte Gleska College
P.O. Box 490
Rosebud, South Dakota 57570

Irene Bordeaux, Chairperson
SGC Board of Directors

and

Lionel R. Bordeaux,
President

April, 1990

Written Testimony-FY'91 Interior Appropriations
U.S. Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs
The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, Chairman
The Honorable Kent Conrad, Field Chairman

SUMMARY STATEMENT

Sinte Gleska College is a young and growing higher education institution chartered by the Rosebud Sioux Tribe in 1971 to design and deliver appropriate post-secondary programs, services and opportunities for the Sicangu Lakota (Rosebud Sioux) People on the Rosebud Reservation.

We are presently seeking Congressional support and assistance in the following:

P.L. 99-428

The foremost concern of Sinte Gleska College in terms of the FY'91 Interior Appropriations Bill centers around funding for P.L. 99-428, "The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, as amended". We now request that Congress consider appropriations of which provide funding of $5,820 per student for Title I tribal colleges in FY'91. Funding at this level, authorized by law, would require $11,032,240 ($5,820 per FTE x 5,372 FTE).

Endowment -- Sinte Gleska College, like its tribal college colleagues, has successfully developed an Endowment Fund to help establish long-range fiscal stability. Future growth depends heavily upon the availability of matching funds. We therefore request funding at the authorized level of $5,000,000.

Technical Assistance -- Funding for the provision of technical assistance support to tribal colleges has remained at $116,000 for the past several years despite expanding needs and continued program development efforts. Sinte Gleska College requests that funding for technical assistance be increased to $220,000; a sum which would provide $10,000 for each eligible tribal college.

Construction -- In FY'90, tribal colleges requested that $22.9 million be appropriated for facilities construction purposes, including our stated need for $2.5 million to complete the proposed Sinte Gleska College Education/Administration Complex. These needs haven't changed; however, in the short term, we request an appropriation of $2 million for emergency repairs at those tribal colleges where there exists serious facilities problems.

Other

-Additional B.I.A. Higher Education Grant (Scholarship) funding to assist tribal members in defraying educational costs at Sinte Gleska College.

-Increased Adult Education funding to provide adequate opportunities and services for G.E.D. and adult literacy programs.

-Increased Adult Vocational Training funding to enable students to pursue vocational education programs that correspond to tribal priorities.

-Restoration of P.L. 93-638 funds, awarded to Sinte Gleska College in 1973 per authority of the Snyder Act, to a funding level of $354,300. These monies were removed from the tribally-shanded IPS budget by the B.I.A. in 1990 only to be restored later at a $136,500 funding level.

Introduction

Sinte Gleska College serves the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation of south-central South Dakota, an area encompassing four counties that cover 5,337 square miles where some 18,000 tribal members reside in twenty communities. Named in honor of Chief Spotted Tail (Sinte Gleska), leader of the Sicangu Lakota (Rosebud Sioux) People, Sinte Gleska College represents an emerging entity in the field of higher education, an Indian college established to respond to the needs of the Native American student who chooses to pursue postsecondary studies while remaining "at home" in a reservation-based setting. Sinte Gleska College is a unique institution which is of, by and for the community. This character enables us to provide a range of accessible programs, that are compatible with local educational priorities and developmental plans of the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and that reflect the cultural values of the Lakota People.

Sinte Gleska College is the only source of higher education opportunity for local students; we are committed to an overall program philosophy which promotes student success through designs and approaches that foster personal esteem and increase individual skills. Sinte Gleska College is the product of tribal members who recognized Chief Spotted Tail's vision for an education that incorporated western thought and Lakota culture. Our graduates are educated to achieve in both Indian and non-Indian society. We see our role to be that of a reservation development base system, which in turn, strengthens communities, the tribe, and ultimately, Sinte Gleska College.

such a premise is the foundation of our institutional mission and reinforces the prevailing sentiment that Sinte Gleska College is an expression of the ambitions of the Lakota People.

Higher Education, Economy and People

The mission statement directs Sinte Gleska College to deliver high quality postsecondary education to the Lakota People. In addition, Sinte Gleska College seeks to:

(1) increase the number of Lakota People in middle and upper management positions.

(2) reflect, strengthen and develop Lakota cultural life.

(3) provide national leadership in tribally-controlled education.

(4) establish mechanisms for improving the quality of life on the Rosebud Reservation.

Economically, the Reservation is extremely depressed, with all of the negative social factors that accompany unemployment. The few employment opportunities that exist are in the public sector. This situation is of grave concern to tribal leaders and elders who are vigorously pursuing economic development on several fronts including microenterprises, industrial development, tourism and government contracting.

Due to the economic development efforts and the educational climate created by Sinte Gleska College, the future looks brighter. However, statistics document a harsh and sometimes overwhelming everyday reality for most people on the Reservation:

- Todd County, which the Rosebud Reservation encompasses, is the 4th poorest county in the nation.
- Per capita income is $3,211.

- Over 60% of all families on the Rosebud Reservation are at or below the poverty level.

- Tribal members possess an average literacy level of 6th grade and an average of 10 years of school completion.

- 55% of the adult population on the Rosebud Reservation have not earned high school diplomas or G.E.D. certification.

Outlook for the Next Decade

In the 1990's more and more tribal members will opt to pursue their higher education at Sinte Gleska College. We have seen too many young students leave their communities and families and go away to school. Soon they would return, unable to find a niche in institutions which seem appropriate for others but not for the Indian student. Our graduates work in the communities to help future generations. Our students must work hard, however, they are dedicated and they have a home in Sinte Gleska College.

Enrollment and Demographic Trends on the Rosebud Reservation

- Enrollment at Sinte Gleska College will continue to increase in slight increments until 1992, when it will range between 525-560 students per semester.

- Enrollment will grow at significantly larger rates once we successfully complete construction of the proposed Sinte Gleska College Education/Administration building, a 35,000 square foot facility on the Antelope campus.

- The average age of Sinte Gleska College students will decrease as a result of more younger tribal members seeking higher education opportunities and the elevating rates of attendance at off-reservation institutions. The younger student population will present a different set of academic needs than those of older Indian adults.

- We will continue to witness a higher percentage of incoming students who will be academically under-prepared and require remedial studies assistance. The result will be a gradual expansion in our Special Support Services Progrm and an increasing demand for tutors.

- More tribal members, especially younger students, will be seeking matriculation in vocational education programs at the certificate and associate degree levels. Sinte Gleska College will be called on to develop more curricula that trains tribal members to meet specific job needs.

- There will be a continual request for more Lakota studies classes on the Rosebud Reservation, both on campus and in the tribal communities, especially language classes. We will need to develop more Lakota Studies curriculum and train more Lakota studies instructors.

- There will remain a need throughout the remainder of this century to provide outreach services to the Lakota People -- we will need to strengthen our Community Education programs and explore new ways to deliver services across the Rosebud Reservation.

Financial Resources

- Sinte Gleska College will continue to operate with limited financial resources and limited facilities, however, we will not do so in a manner that detracts from academic quality. -- This status restricts institutional opportunities for program expansion.

- Sinte Gleska College will continue to be dependent on federal funding and rely upon numerous revenue sources through grants and other "soft" monies. -- This status will provide adequate stability for current operations **but** will prolong efforts to establish a permanent funding base.

- The main avenue for institutional funding will be P.L. 99-428, "The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, as amended". -- we will continue to seek Congressional support for increased appropriations and to add funds to the Endowment and Construction programs of this legislation.

- We will continue to strengthen our relationship with private funding sources, particularly foundations. Sinte Gleska College must increase its national stability to generate greater support from the corporate sector.

- Inflationary increases will raise institutional operating costs and necessitate salary increases for Sinte Gleska College faculty and staff, who are already underpaid by any standard.

- Sinte Gleska College will continue to assess program delivery in order to gain added cost-efficiency that emphasizes more employee responsibility and accountability with minimal resources. -- We must continue to demonstrate that Sinte Gleska College is a leader in the field of Indian Education.

- Cost efficiency decisions will require greater and more expedient access to institutional informational sites and thereby increase the need for expanded automation of programs and functions. -- We must balance the high cost of these efforts with our otherwise limited resources.

- The increased need for financial assistance among Sinte Gleska Colleges students will require external support from new sources. -- A responsiveness to student needs must remain our predominant concern as Sinte Gleska College strives for growth and self-sufficiency.

Opportunities in the Surrounding Community

- Unemployment will remain high on the Rosebud Reservation. Nonetheless, Sinte Gleska College graduates who are tribal members will opt to compete for local job opportunities. We must take a more aggressive role in job placement for our graduates, especially those at the associate levels.

- The Todd County School Districts will continue to hire Sinte Gleska College Elementary Education graduates as classroom teachers. There remains a great need for teachers who are familiar with the local area and who are sensitive to the concerns of native children.

- The area hospital will become the second largest employer on the Rosebud Reservation and will supply the needs for trained health professionals.

FY'91 Department of Interior Appropriations

Institutional Concerns

- Increased P.L. 99-428 (The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978, as amended) appropriations for salary raises, additional staff and program expansion.

- $3.3 million dollars for completion of the proposed Sinte Gleska College Education/Administration Building, originally started in 1978.

- Additional B.I.A. Higher Education Grant (Scholarship) Program funds are required to assist tribal members in defraying post-secondary educational expenses at Sinte Gleska College.

- Increased funding for adult literacy programs and G.E.D. services in order to deliver an adequate level of tribal adult education opportunities on the Rosebud Reservation.

- The current demand for adult vocational training opportunities far exceeds the amount of available funds to meet student needs and thereby fails to address tribal vocational education priorities.

- Restoration of P.L. 95-638 funds, awarded to Sinte Gleska College per authority of the Snyder Act in 1971, to a funding level of $358,000. These funds were removed from the tribally-banded budget by the B.I.A. in 1980 only to be restored later at a $150,000 funding level. Sinte Gleska College has suffered a total cumulative loss of $2,000,000 in Snyder Act funds since FY'81 and requests a restoration to the initial $358,000 level but not at the expense of annual tribal allocations.

- Continued Congressional support for the White House Conference on Indian Education with particular emphasis on the role of tribal colleges relative to planning and facilitating conference activities and program agenda.

- Lack of advocacy by the B.I.A. on behalf of tribal colleges witnessed in annual appropriations testimony where B.I.A. officials state that tribal colleges are adequately funded and that tribal college funding is meant to be "seed" or start-up $. This latter point was never the intent of the tribal college legislation.

The ensuing testimony discussion relates to P.L. 93-638 programs and to P.L. 99-428 at Sinte Gleska College, as funded through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Scholarship

Sinte Gleska College administers the B.I.A. Higher Education Grant (Scholarship) Program via a P.L. 93-638 contract on behalf of tribal members who wish to pursue their higher education goals while remaining "at home" on the Rosebud Reservation. Sinte Gleska College has managed this contract for its students since 1978 and does so today on a shared basis (50%-50%) with the Local Indian Education, Inc. which provides funding for students attending off-reservation institutions.

During the 1988-89 academic year Sinte Gleska College awarded B.I.A. Scholarship funding to 138 students with an average award of $1,689. We estimate that 185 students were not funded because of depleted monies and further estimate, based on the average B.I.A. award, that Sinte Gleska College would require an additional $315,000 to assist these unfunded students. The Local Indian Education, Inc. estimates that it would require an additional $160,000 to assist unfunded students attending off-reservation institutions. The total unmet need for Rosebud Agency students is approximately $500,000; an amount which is sure to increase throughout the 1990's.

At this time Sinte Gleska College requests that the B.I.A. give strong consideration to a significant increase in overall funding for the B.I.A. Higher Education Grant (Scholarship) Program. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe has watched its allocation

decrease from a high level of $553,000 in FY'87 to the present FY'90 level of $528,000. We on the Rosebud Reservation need at least $1,000,000 to provide adequate B.I.A. Scholarship funding for our current students and for future generations of students who seek to advance their educational interests for the Rosebud Sioux Tribe and the Lakota People.

T.C.C.C. (Snyder Act Supplement)

These funds are used for faculty and support staff salaries and the cost of leasing G.S.A. vehicles for the Sinte Gleska College Student Transportation System.

Sinte Gleska College originally received this particular revenue in 1973 per authority of the Snyder Act. In 1975, these funds became allocated as part of the P.L. 93-638 contracting process. Between 1978-1980 Sinte Gleska College and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe increased these funds to a level of $358,100 in order to assist in establishing a stable fiscal base to defray on-going institutional operating costs. In FY'81, the B.I.A. moved to eliminate this source of funding for Sinte Gleska College and, at one point, totally removed the monies from the tribally "handed" budget. Sinte Gleska College and the Rosebud Sioux Tribe worked diligently to restore these funds to a level of $138,500 which in 1985, through Pub. 93-638 pay cost increases, has now reached a level of $144,000. In the past ten years Sinte Gleska College has lost more than $1,000,000 in T.C.C.C. (Snyder Act Supplement) funds as a result of this unilateral administrative determination by the B.I.A.

As we begin the 1990's, Sinte Gleska College is once again requesting a restoration of T.C.C.C. (Snyder Act Supplement) funds to a level of $358,000 which were decreased, without tribal knowledge or consent, in FY'81. We are specifically requesting that these monies be restored to the Rosebud Agency/Rosebud Sioux Tribe "banded" IPA budget beginning in FY'92 and for each year thereafter to remedy this unjustified B.I.A. reduction action.

Adult Education

These funds are used for personnel costs and other minimal Adult Education program expenses. During the past five years Sinte Gleska College has witnessed a decrease in Adult Education funds from $49,000 to the current FY'90 level of $41,000.

We request that the B.I.A. support a position which calls for a substantial increase in Adult Education funding. Sinte Gleska College has contracted the Adult Education program since 1972 and over the past 18 years has assisted 1,200+ individuals in earning G.E.D. certification. Because of present funding cuts we have been forced to implement serious reductions in testing and tutoring opportunities on the Rosebud Reservation. Such reductions continue to occur at a critical time for Indian education; a time when all programs, including the provision of Adult Education services, must grow and expand to prepare Indian country for the challenges in the next century.

Adult Vocational Training

These funds, in the amount of $113,000 (FY'90), are used primarily to provide stipends for students engaged in vocational

training program pursuits. Sinte Gleska College began administering this program in 1988 and is currently in the second year of a P.L. 93-638 contract due to expire in 1991.

As in the case of Adult Education funding, Sinte Gleska College believes that an increase in Adult Vocational Training monies is essential to improve conditions for Indian tribes. We also need to promote reservation-based vocational education training opportunities, such as the programs offered at Sinte Gleska College, to help build stronger local economies and provide tribal members with employable skills centering around tribal priority areas. Here too, the key is to advocate for additional funds so that more Indian students become involved in the educational process and attain a goal which empowers tribal self-determination and enhances our ability to effectively manage tribal resources in the year 2000 and beyond.

P.L 99-428

In 1978, tribal colleges gained a big boost in funding efforts with the passage of P.L. 95-471, "The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act". Appropriations started on a college-by-college basis in 1981, when tribal colleges received $1,000 per Indian full-time student equivalent. However, in the ensuing years, as the number of tribal colleges and student enrollment increased, the appropriations failed to keep pace with educational operating costs. By 1985, tribal colleges were receiving a mere $1,820 per Indian student equivalent. Currently appropriated at $5.8 million, this legislation is central to the survival and viability of tribal colleges. We will realize an

increase in appropriations in FY'90 which yields a funding amount of $2,190 - $2,400 per full-time Indian student equivalent....In other words, an increase to our FY'85 funding level. This increase nonetheless represents an important first step in addressing the numerous funding concerns for tribal colleges in terms of salaries, academic program development and facilities. To do so, we cannot rely on the year to year fluctuations of "soft" funding which dictates the flow and scope of each expenditure. We require the latitude and support of P.L. 99-428 funding--funds that provide $5,820 per full-time Indian student equivalent as authorized by current legislative language.

Moreover, we require advocacy from the B.I.A. in seeking increased appropriations "to defray expenditures for academic, educational and administrative purposes and for the operation and maintenance of the tribal college". P.L. 99-428 funding was never intended as seed money.

American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC)

By way of verbal testimony, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium cited numerous issues set forth in the special report Tribal Colleges: Shaping the Future of Native America, by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In particular, this report corroborated a long-standing AIHEC position: that funding at the authorized P.L. 99-428 funding level of $5,820 per FTE is imperative if tribal colleges are to fulfill their institutional missions. Tribal colleges have proven their capacities to use scarce resources effectively. Now, more money is required.

In addition, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium has identified other concerns which tribal colleges believe warrant Congressional attention:

- that tribal colleges be recognized as key entities in future overall tribal development efforts and initiatives in order to promote the educational interests and needs of tribes and tribal members.

- that P.L. 100-713, the Indian Health Care Amendments Act of 1988 (Title I, Indian Health Manpower, Section 115, Health Training Programs of Community Colleges) authorizes $100,000 for each tribal college for the development of health programs.

- that appropriations for the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Educational Act allow for funding in the amount of $175,000 per tribal college along with the opportunity to compete for and administer grants through the tribal set-aside program.

In closing, Sinte Gleska College joins its fellow American Indian Higher Education Consortium members in requesting Congressional assistance with these considerations so that we may produce an equitable educational opportunity for our Indian students. We thank the Sub-committee for the many past efforts on behalf of Indian Education, and especially, the support to Sinte Gleska College.

Testimony submitted by Paul Boyer
on tribally-controlled colleges

April 9, 1990

Tribally controlled colleges have demonstrated over the past two decades that they are able to offer their communities educational opportunity. Working with extremely limited resources in reservations marked by poverty, tribal colleges have nonetheless proven that they can offer real change to Native American societies.

This is what we concluded at the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as we completed a two-year study of these institutions. From our research, interviews and extended visits to seven of the colleges we assert in our report, Tribal Colleges: Shaping the Future of Native America, that their success is real and, with stronger support, their potential is significant.

The colleges have been able to challenge the multiple barriers faced by Indian students because they are controlled by Native Americans and work within the context of the surrounding tribal culture. The needs of students -- from the physical to the emotional -- are understood and accepted. In addition, they also work to bring opportunity directly to the reservation community by developing innovative social and economic development programs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

■ First, tribal colleges offer a culture-based curriculum where traditional Indian culture is celebrated. Not seen as just another area of study, Native American traditions and values are at they heart of each tribal college's structure and identity. While much of white society identifies Indians with objects of the past--from tipis to peace pipes--tribal colleges argue that traditional culture is more than artifacts. It is, instead, a nurturing and supportive influence that helps to define an individual's self-identity. With this students are told, perhaps for the first time, that their culture has value.

But this emphasis on Native American culture should not be seen as an attempt to withdraw from contemporary society. Instead, an understanding of their past is seen as a way to build a stronger future. For example, at least one study has shown that the Indian students who understand and accept their heritage have greater self-respect and are more likely to succeed academically.

Reported Salish Kootenai College Vice President Jerry Slater. "Many young people have had a hart time. They have a history of heavy drinking and have, in general, a lack of self-respect. But as they get more involved in traditional culture, they begin to get new self-respect. Sometimes they will quit their drinking as begin to find a life that is more meaningful for them."

■ Second, tribal colleges offer training for tribal needs. Because they are, in most cases, located on reservations and are run by tribal members, they know what skills their communities require. While courses range from certificates in welding to, at one college, a master's degree in elementary eduction, each college's curriculum is based on the understanding that most tribal members do not want to leave the reservation. Instead, the colleges


AIIM
Association for Information and Image Management
1100 Wayne Avenue, Suite 1100
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
301/587-8202
Centimeter
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 mm
Inches
1 2 3 4 5
1.0
1.1
1.25
1.4
1.6
1.8
2.0
2.2
2.5
MANUFACTURED TO AIIM STANDARDS
BY APPLIED IMAGE, INC.

tailor their curriculum to the needs and opportunities that exist in their communities. No non-Indian college or university can offer this direct link between the programs offered by the school and the needs of the reservation.

But the idea is not to just produce a cadre of productive laborers. Instead, tribal college administrators want their institutions to promote greater Native American leadership. True self-determination can be promoted only when students are trained to become leaders in their reservations as well as the nation as a whole. The numbers are still small, but there are a growing number of people who attended an Indian college and now have earned four-year or even graduate degrees and hold administrative positions in area schools, social service agencies or government offices.

■ Third, tribal colleges sponsor development programs that directly benefit their reservations. Believing that their responsibilities are not limited to the students who enroll in their schools, all work to bring economic development and combat debilitating social ills. Some work directly with area industries to provide training and sponsor research. Others sponsor literacy, tutoring and alcohol awareness programs. Most offer courses leading to the high school equivalency test.

Through all of this work, the colleges act as a catalyst to bring positive, well-directed change to Native American communities. But what is so remarkable is how much they have accomplished with such limited resources. Campuses are often little more than collections of trailers on

storefront buildings where space is always at a premium. Faculty and staff must be severely restricted.

Federal support has been essential for the survival of the colleges. The Carnegie report urges federal lawmakers to maintain funding and ensure that appropriations keep pace with the growth of Indian student enrollment. Tribal colleges have proven that they can succeed. We would like to see them have the opportunity to excel.

Community, Technical and Junior College Journal
Dec/Jan 1989-90

The Tribal College

Teaching Self-Determination

A

A Bold Experiment

A Culture-Based Curriculum

Training for Tribal Needs

The Need for State and Federal Support



The Need for Professional Development

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN McCAIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM ARIZONA, VICE CHAIRMAN, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for scheduling the hearing today to hear testimony on my bill S. 2167, to reauthorize funding for the tribally controlled community colleges and their endowment program, and on S. 2213, Senator Conrad's bill to increase the authorization for the endowment program and make other changes, a bill I was pleased to co-sponsor.

The first of these bills, S. 2167, would reauthorize appropriations for the tribally controlled community colleges through 1992. It is a two-year authorization, rather than one of longer duration, at the request of the American Indian Higher Education Consortium and represents a decision made by tribal college presidents earlier this year. I look forward to testimony on this element of the bill. If college presidents desire a four- or five year authorization, I am, of course, willing to amend my bill.

With regard to the Navajo Community College I will point out that its authorization for funding for its operation is a continuing one. The provision in my bill relating to this college

is to assure continued authorization to receive construction grants.

Even though S. 2167 only a reauthorization measure as it stands, I want to use this occasion to offer my views on the importance of tribal colleges in higher education.

These community colleges meet needs of American Indians that are not being met by other institutions of higher education. They reflect the cultures and the aspirations of the tribes that govern them: their curricula may include Indian cultures and languages, as well as the curricula found in other community colleges: they provide supportive learning environments to students whose previous instruction may have been deficient: and their reservation settings make higher education accessible and encourage continued learning by young and old alike.

And what these colleges do, they do well. Their graduates go on to jobs or to four-year schools. And those who enter four-year schools are less likely to drop out than those who have not had the tribal college experience.

The success tribal colleges have achieved has been achieved despite inadequate funding and facilities which are often poor. Congressional authorization of $5,820 per student has not been matched by appropriations, I regret to say.

I am hopeful that we will be able to further increase the funding for tribal colleges this year, perhaps, in part, through the Congressionally-authorized tribal college endowment fund. In my floor statement on this bill, I applauded President Bush for proposing a tripling of the endowment program for historically black colleges and universities, and I look forward to working with him to obtain the increase in the endowment program for tribally-controlled community colleges which my distinguished colleague, Senator Conrad has proposed.

Mr. Chairman, the tribally-controlled community colleges of this nation have been for too long but little noticed for the important roles they play in affording higher education opportunities to American Indians. Late last year, however, they gained new visibility with the publication of Tribal Colleges: Shaping the Future of Native America, the product of a two-year study conducted by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

In this publication is described the richness of the tribal college experience for students and for the communities they serve, and the poverty of their resources. Its action plan looks to private sources of funding, as well as to the Congress, to strengthen the abilities of the colleges to serve Indian people and communities as they ought to be served.

The Carnegie report also looks to the promise of the tribal colleges, saying, "They can, with adequate support, continue to open doors of opportunity to the coming generations and help Native American communities bring together a cohesive society, one that draws inspiration from the past in order to shape a creative, inspired vision of the future."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act: Why More Funds are Needed

A Report Prepared by the

American Indian Higher Education Consortium

March 30, 1990

Preface

This report has been prepared by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC). Its purpose is to provide evidence and information to support a request to substantially enlarge the FY 1981 appropriation for the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act. All of the AIHEC institutions participated in providing information for the report. Included were enrollment figures, tuition levels, needs, outcomes, and, most important, the colleges' prospects for the future.

AIHEC received assistance from Dr. Robert Sullivan, Director of Special Projects at North Dakota State University, in compiling the information and developing this report. Dr. Sullivan has had some twenty years of experience working directly with the Indian reservations in both Dakotas and Montana in the areas of economic and community development. He is familiar with AIHEC, working with it and several of its member colleges since the tribal colleges came into being. And finally, as a member of the Administrative Council at North Dakota State University, he has a thorough knowledge of post-secondary education and its finances.

AIHEC requested Dr. Sullivan's assistance because they wished to develop a report which reflected an outside view of their accomplishments and current situation. The tribal college presidents and governing boards' leadership believe they have been successful in this endeavor.

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.	1
Background	1
Tribal Colleges Accomplishments: The "Payoffs".	3
Tribal College Funding: A Crisis Situation	4
The Tribal College Funding Crisis: Its Impact.	13
What is Needed and Why.	24

The Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act:
Why More Funds Are Needed

Introduction

This report provides evidence to support the tribally-controlled colleges' request for a very substantial increase in the funds available to them in FY 1991 under Title I of the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act. The evidence it provides addresses specific issues that have been repeatedly raised in past appropriations hearings for the Act. Consecutively, the report begins by reviewing what might be termed the payoffs from the tribally-controlled colleges, e.g., Indian people becoming employable and leaving the welfare rolls. It then provides an analysis of the tribally-controlled colleges' funding situation, e.g., contrasting their funding levels with those of comparable non-Indian institutions. This is followed by an assessment of the impact of these funding shortfalls on the tribally-controlled colleges, e.g., the problems they face in maintaining academic quality on a shrinking instructional funding base. And finally, the report analyzes and provides supporting evidence for the colleges' request that funding under the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act be increased to $7,500 annually per full-time Indian student, the level called for under the Act's original authorization. Before turning to the body of the report, however, some background on the tribally-controlled community college movement and its funding history.

Background. The tribally-controlled community college

will again drop below $1,000 in FY 1991 unless there is a further increase in the overall appropriation. The reasons for this are not difficult to discern. Enrollments at the tribally-controlled colleges have risen rapidly from the beginning; the amount appropriated to the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act has not. Chart 1 on the following page depicts the tribally-controlled colleges' funding history under the Act from 1981 on. What the chart reveals is a continuing increase in FTE among the tribally-controlled colleges and a continuing decrease in federal funding per FTE under the Community College Assistance Act. In short words, the better the colleges perform, the less funds they receive per student.

[illegible] the Tribal Colleges: The "Payoff"

The tribal colleges have performed very well. They have been of immeasurable importance in tribal revitalization and the creation of hope and pride on their respective reservations. They have become a primary player in the economic and social development of those reservations, changing the lives and futures of the local Indian people. Put simply, they are a paradigm of Indian self-determination and what it can make. Their brief histories have demonstrated that, given the opportunity, Indian people are very able to operate their affairs and improve their lives.

It is unlikely that anyone who is familiar with the development and history of the tribally-controlled colleges would disagree with any of the points made above. It is also unlikely that anyone would fail to agree that the dollar value of the


Tribal College Enrollment - Funding History
Total FTE
Total ISC
Dollars per ISC
Congressional Sub-Committee
Senate Request
Actual
House Request
BIA Request
Enrollment - Funding Per ISC
Fiscal Year
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991

impact of the tribally-controlled colleges on reservation life far outweighs the dollar value of the federal investment in the colleges. Indeed, past appropriation hearings on the tribally-controlled Indian Community College Assistance Act have clearly revealed the prevalence of these sentiments.

However, it has also been apparent at past hearings that although everyone agrees that the overall benefits produced by the colleges far outweigh their costs, no effort has been made to translate those surplus benefits into specific dollar amounts. Consequently, what AIHEC has done here is to survey six of the tribal colleges in order to provide some information and dollar amounts on the welfare savings and increased federal tax payments generated by those Indian people who have taken advantage of the opportunities the tribal colleges offer.

The colleges surveyed to obtain this information are Oglala Lakota, Sinte Gleska, Standing Rock, Turtle Mountain, Salish Kootenai, and Blackfeet. All six are fully accredited, with Oglala Lakota and Sinte Gleska being accredited for the bachelor's degree and the bachelor's and master's, respectively. All are among the larger of the tribally-controlled colleges. Information was obtained from them for the period 1981 - 1986. It reveals the following facts.

1. A total of 1575 Indian people graduated from the six institutions during this period. Of this 1575, 210 earned one year vocational certificates, 1198 earned associate degrees, 156 earned bachelor's degrees, while 9 earned master's degrees in Education.

2. On the average, one-third of these 1575 graduates (almost entirely certificate and associate degree graduates) continued their education following graduation -- many have since graduated with more advanced degrees, e.g., a bachelor's degree.

c. Those who did not continue their education sought employment, as did those who sought higher degrees once those were completed.

d. Most important, information the colleges were able to provide indicates that only 12% to 17% (depending on the reservation) of those 1575 graduates are currently unemployed. These unemployment rates contrast strikingly with the unemployment rates of Indian people on the same reservations who did not attend the tribal college. Those rates range from 54% on the Flathead Reservation (the home of the Salish Kootenai College) to as high as 85% on the Rosebud Reservation (the home of Sinte Gleska College).

Two conclusions can be drawn immediately from these numbers. To begin with, the colleges are having a major impact on reservation Indian peoples' employability. Second, the tribal colleges are also having a major impact on the number of degrees, including four-year or more advanced degrees, being obtained by reservation Indian people. In the past, less than 10% of the reservation Indian students who went directly from high school graduation to a non-Indian, two year or four year institution succeeded in obtaining a degree (and since only about 10% of the high school graduates attempted to go to a non-Indian institution, the overall success rate for high school graduates was actually around 1%). The percentage of success at non-Indian institutions for those Indian students whose first post-secondary experience involved graduating from one of the tribally-controlled colleges rises to between 12% and 40%. It should also be noted here that the six colleges were able to track a number of their former students who had transferred to non-Indian four year institutions following the completion of one year at the tribal college, and it was found that about 10% of those students were successful in obtaining a degree. These success

percentages are striking considering that the average age of the students at the tribal colleges is 30, and that many have children. They speak eloquently to the quality of the tribal colleges and their role in bringing advanced post-secondary training and education to the reservations.

These two conclusions are obvious; they reflect the information obtained from the six tribal colleges surveyed. However, it is also possible to draw some second order conclusions based on the information obtained from the colleges. The first of these conclusions concerns the welfare savings generation by Indian people obtaining employment. The point was already made that an average of 15% of the 1575 graduates from the six colleges in question are currently unemployed. This, of course, means that 85% are employed. And, when we add another piece of data, the fact that the majority of these 1575 graduates were on either general assistance or AFDC prior to their educational training, it is clear that the annual savings in welfare monies are very significant. The average monthly payment for a family of four (and recall that most of the students at the tribal colleges have from two to four or five dependents) in the U.S. for most Montana averages around $450 monthly. This totals more than $5,400 per family per year, and even if we take a very conservative view and assume that only 700 of that 1575 graduates were formerly on some type of assistance, the annual welfare savings for that group are $3.8 million dollars.

Similar logic can be applied to the federal tax monies being generated by these tribal college graduates. Once again, we will

take a conservative view. It will be assumed that the 1340 (85% of 1575) currently employed are earning an average of $18,000 annually. (Recall that a substantial percentage have bachelors degrees.) And since a family of four was used as the basis for calculating welfare savings, it will also be used to calculate tax revenues. Annual income tax payments for a family of four taking standard deductions on a gross income of $18,000 would be in the neighborhood of $750. However, in addition to these income tax revenues, it should also be recognized that on an income of $18,000, each family will be generating $1,360 per year in social security taxes.

Would some of these individuals be working even if they had not attended the tribal college? Of course they would. So once again, we will use the same conservative multiplier used in connection with welfare payments, 700 families. Seven hundred families, times $1,360 in social security payments plus $750 in income tax payments, totals a direct tax return to the federal treasury of almost $1.5 million annually. For those of you who are aware of the amount each institution receives annually in Tribal Community College Assistance Act funds, it should be apparent that the combined annual welfare savings and new taxes resulting from only the most visible educational accomplishment, i.e., the graduates, of these six colleges are appreciably greater than the amount the six colleges receive annually as Community College assistance funds even under the very conservative conditions described above.

And in point of fact, these most visible accomplishments only

responsible for part of the dollar payoffs from the tribal colleges. What must also be noted is that a large proportion of the educational activities of these colleges involve people who are not seeking a degree. Instead, they are upgrading their skills, and, in turn, their income. Tribal and local BIA employees have had the opportunity to obtain new skills at the college, e.g., typists who have learned and are now using word processing. By the same token, individual ranchers and farmers have had the opportunity to participate in courses in general agriculture and recordkeeping. Or again, the majority of the colleges are providing courses in business management and the results have been an increase in the number of local Indian entrepreneurs. No effort has been made to put dollar figures on these added payoffs. However, they speak for themselves.

Tribal Colleges Funding: A Crisis Situation

The point was made earlier that from the beginning there has been a continuing decline in the per student funding provided to the tribal colleges under the Community College Assistance Act. Per student (FTSC) funding was at its highest point, $2,100, in FY 1981. It dropped to $1,662 in FY 1984. And while it rose slightly to $1,710 in FY 1986, it will once again drop below $1,600 (substantially below if BIA recommendations are accepted) in FY 1987. The impact of these continuing shortfalls in funding on the tribally controlled colleges will be reviewed at length in the next section of this report. But clearly the impact has been detrimental. It threatens the academic quality of the tribal colleges. It has become a concern to their various accreditation

agencies, e.g., the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools.

Furthermore, the magnitude of the crisis in tribal college funding is actually more substantial than these nominal dollar figures indicate. For between rising prices and inflation over the past nine years, it would take $4,805 today to equal the purchasing power of $1,100 in 1981. At the same time, however, the best the colleges have been able to do with respect to their Community College Assistance Act funding over the past nine years is to obtain occasional, moderate increases which, as was illustrated earlier in Chart 1, have done little more than assure that the downward trend of funding over the past nine years has not been a straight line.

Several factors, or more often, misperceptions, have contributed to the colleges' funding crisis. To begin with, the federal government is operating at a substantial deficit. TBC leaders recognize this fact and they recognize that their funding will be affected. But they also recognize that the amount of money being distributed annually under Title I of the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act is minuscule, currently a little over $10 million. And they also recognize that the colleges have never received anything near the $5,820 per IBC called for under the original authorization of the Act. And finally, they recognize that when rising costs and inflation are taken into account, the reductions in Community College Assistance Act funding greatly exceed those suffered by other federal programs.

When these facts are coupled with the fact that it is generally agreed that the tribally-controlled community colleges are the most significant development to occur on the Indian reservations in the past fifteen years, a request to substantially increase the small community college appropriation would not seem unreasonable, particularly in light of the fact that, as was shown earlier, the colleges are generating more income in welfare savings and tax payments than they are receiving under the Act. How many federal programs are doing that anywhere today?

Second, Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel continue to promulgate the notion that the Tribally-Controlled College Assistance Act is to "provide seed money for tribal colleges to obtain additional financial assistance from other sources to complement their total budgets." Anyone with even a basic understanding of post-secondary education would find this statement mind-boggling. Institutions of higher education are not profit-making enterprises; one can not start them with a little "seed money" and assume they will become self-supporting. The reason is simple. There are simply no unrestricted funds available anywhere sufficient to support the ongoing operational costs of the tribally-controlled colleges. Clearly, it can not be done through student tuition as tribal colleges has already been increasing to as an some of a little above $1,000 annually [illegible] three-fifths existing endowment, [illegible] a point where students are having a difficult time obtaining sufficient financial aid to attend the colleges. [illegible]

only the 1% Set Aside for Vocational Education is semi-operational. But even here it must be recognized that these monies are for vocational education -- not the broader academic programs. And it should be recognized that not only the 1% Set Aside, but all of these other programs such as Strengthening Developing Institutions are discretionary and highly competitive.

This lack of understanding on the part of BIA personnel over the difference between restricted and unrestricted funding programs has caused major problems for the community colleges. They have been confronted with such simplistic formulas as dividing the number of full time students at the institutions into their total revenues for the year (40% of which are restricted funds at the average tribal college), and concluding that the dividend which emerges represents the amount of funds available per student for general instructional and operational purposes. On the contrary, to reiterate what was said earlier, the funds available for general day-to-day college operation, e.g., instruction, are comprised of the Community College Assistance Act monies and student tuition. Currently, the tribal colleges are obtaining on the average roughly 60% of their total restricted and unrestricted budget from the Community College Assistance Act. They are obtaining, on the average, another 20% from tuition. And the sum of these two, or approximately 80% of their total budget, is what the colleges have for instruction, student services, instructional support activities, administration, facilities management . . . . In short, everything. No public institution of higher education in the

United States operates under comparable circumstances. Nor does any public institution regard or include the restricted funds they receive as part of their general operating budget.

The fourth misperception that the tribal colleges are invariably faced with at appropriations time centers around the supposed unwillingness of their tribal governments to provide them with annual funding. This assertion is both specious and disingenuous. The assertion is specious because a number of the tribes are providing some funds to their colleges either through the BIA Indian Priority System or directly from the tribes' general funds. The assertion is disingenuous because, as is well known, the great majority of tribes have very little in the way of funds and what little they have is needed to support tribal government and meet local needs ranging from social services to economic development. In other words, all of the concerned tribes would be very willing to provide supplementary funds to their tribal colleges if they had any. And unlike the assertion that the tribes have been unwilling to contribute to their colleges, there is evidence for this last statement. The tribes have contributed buildings, land, maintenance services [illegible] an inventory of the specific contributions could stretch for several sentences. But only a few tribes have been in a position to contribute hard dollar funding annually. In point of fact, unlike the Community College Assistance Act, the tribal contributions can legitimately be described as "hard money".

The fifth and most frustrating argument the tribal colleges have been confronted with in their continuing efforts to resolve

their funding situation (crisis) can be paraphrased as follows: "Since the colleges are able to function on their current Community College Assistance Act appropriations, how do they justify an increase?" This question has surfaced at every appropriations hearings from the beginning. Meanwhile, the annual per student allocation of Community College Assistance Act funds continues to decrease.

The answer to the question is obvious. The colleges have been able to maintain their operations, i.e., function, through a combination of faculty and staff commitment -- the 50 to 60 hour work week is commonplace -- and cutting corners. Both of these expedients will, of course, fail over the long term. The personal commitment of its employees can enable an institution to survive for a long time, but not forever. Programs can be trimmed, class sizes enlarged, libraries maintained at minimal levels, equipment repaired and repaired, more part-time instructors used, full-time faculty provided with no opportunities to keep abreast of disciplinary developments. But once again, at some point it comes to an end. For academic quality has vanished along the way.

The typical colleges are approaching that end point. Recall that the $1,140 per FTE the colleges received in 1981 was just slightly more than half of the $2,020 authorized in the original Act -- and the $1,140 was inadequate to meet the colleges' operating needs. But today, at a $2,000 per FTE figure, the colleges have well under half of what they received per FTE in 1981, since it now requires $4,805 to equal the purchasing power

of $2,100 in 1981. The impact of ten years of steadily declining funding will be detailed at length in the next section of this report. But it should be obvious from these numbers that the colleges are in a very serious funding crisis despite their acknowledged successes. It is hard to understand why. At times it seems that the tribal colleges are being allocated just enough money to insure their eventual demise.

By now it is undoubtedly apparent that the continuing decreases in annual community college ISC funding allocations coupled with the fact that the colleges are unable to raise tuition any higher (it is already well above comparable two year public institutions) have put them into a serious funding crisis. To be sure, the evidence advanced for this conclusion thus far has been what might be termed internal. But there is also substantial external evidence. AIHEC has made comparisons between annual per student operational costs at comparable public community colleges as well as at two BIA-operated institutions.

The first, and in many ways the most intriguing of these comparisons, is with the two BIA institutions, Haskell Junior College and Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute (SIPI), which is also a two year institution. In FY 1991, Haskell's appropriation was $7,873,000. The number of students attending Haskell for the year totalled 765 (arrived at by averaging actual Fall attendance and an estimate of Spring attendance). If one divides for students into $7,873,000, one arrives at a per student allocation of just over $10,000. Furthermore, it should be noted that these are described as "enrolled" students.

Haskell is apparently not being held to the stricter standard of FTE.

SIPI did a little better. Their enrollment was approximately 975 for the year, and funding was $4,156,000. Their annual per student funding was thus just under $7,800. Again, these numbers were enrolled students; they were not described as FTE. Not surprisingly, tribal college leaders find the contrast between what the BIA apparently needs per student to run Bureau schools and what they feel the tribal colleges need per student to operate their institutions, somewhat ironic.

Similar differences can also be found between the tribal colleges and two year institutions in Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming. The per student cost for 1989 - 1990 for the three, two year public colleges in Montana was $4,340, of which $3,838 was state and local funding, while tuition accounted for the remaining $502. Actually, however, the averaged cost for the three colleges is somewhat deceptive since two of the colleges are appreciably larger than the tribal community colleges and their cost per student is therefore lower. The best comparison is with the third college, Dawson Community College in Glendive, Montana. Its student FTE in 1989-1990 is 280 -- very comparable to the six colleges surveyed here. The cost per FTE at Dawson is $4,840, of which, again, tuition is only $500.

The tribal colleges are also far behind the two year public institutions in North Dakota. Since two of the North Dakota two year institutions are very much larger than any of the tribally-controlled community colleges, the only comparison will be made

with the other three two year colleges, whose enrollments are comparable to those of the tribal colleges. For 1989 - 1990, the per student FTE costs at these three institutions averaged $5,030. This $5,030 was comprised of just under $3,800 in state monies and just over $1,200 in tuition.

The disparity between per student cost at the two year colleges in Wyoming and the tribally-controlled colleges is almost as great, even though all seven of the Wyoming two year schools are substantially larger than the tribal colleges -- which normally results in a much lower cost per student. Indeed Wyoming has only been included in the present comparison because the state's size and sparse population assures that its two year schools are comparable to the tribal colleges in terms of rural isolation. Be that as it may, the average cost per student at the seven schools in Wyoming for 1988-1989 (the latest figures) was $4,350 annually, of which just under $800 was tuition and the remainder state and local funds.[1]

Finally, let it be noted that the types of costs at the public colleges are identical with the costs included under the allocation per student for the tribal colleges. They are conventional operational costs. They do not include monies for construction or any type of major equipment or facilities improvements. Furthermore, it should also be recognized that, as

---

[1]BIA and state per student cost figures were obtained from Bureau documents, Deputy Commissioner John Hutchinson of the Montana State Board of Higher Education, Assistant Commissioner Terry Dwelle of the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education, and Mrs. Helen Stevens of the Wyoming Commission on Community Colleges.

part of state systems, all these public two year colleges have reduced operating costs in such areas as fuel, supplies, etc., because of the magnitude of their purchasing activities. The tribal colleges do not have these types of savings.

The Tribal College Funding Crisis: Its Impact

Barring a substantial increase in the FY 1991 appropriation for the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act, the tribally-controlled colleges will be faced with yet another year of major funding shortfalls. The evidence for this conclusion is indisputable. Annual tribal college FTE funding is far below that of public two year institutions in the Great Plains and Rocky Mountain states cited here. And of course it is even further below what BIA believes is needed per student for Haskell Junior College and Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute. Indeed, the combined tuition and Community College Assistance Act funding the tribal colleges have per FSC is less than one-third of the $10,000 per student allocation provided to Haskell Junior College. And the total FY 1990 appropriation for all of the tribal colleges is less than the combined appropriation for Haskell and SIPI.

Occasional comments were made earlier regarding the impact of these annual funding shortfalls on the tribal community colleges, particular emphasis being placed on the inevitable decline in the academic quality of the tribal colleges' programs. This same concern has been expressed by the tribal colleges' regional Accreditation Associations in several instances. The Accreditation Associations warn that continued funding

shortfalls, and, in turn, a decline in the colleges' academic quality, will eventually affect their accreditation status. In the view of the leaders at the tribal colleges, that inevitable decline, if it is not already underway, is beginning. And this section of the report cites some of the specific ways the colleges are being affected.

Instructional Quality

1. Faculty salaries at tribal colleges continue to fall further behind faculty salaries at public two year colleges. Currently, faculty salaries at the tribal colleges range from $19,000 to $21,000 annually. Average faculty salary at public two year institutions is in the neighborhood of $30,000, e.g., in North Dakota it is $29,200. The impact of this salary differential is already appearing in the form of faculty turnover at the tribal colleges.

2. By the same token, employee fringe benefits such as medical insurance, average far less than employee benefits at public institutions. And once again, they are falling further and further behind.

3. All of the colleges are forced to hire substantial numbers of part-time instructors on a per credit hour basis since they simply can not afford to hire the necessary number of faculty full-time. The consequences of this are particularly adverse. To begin with, quality and commitment are less apparent among the part-time instructors. But perhaps more important, they do not develop supportive relationships with the students, since their only obligation is to teach a class two or three times weekly and leave.

Instructional Support

1. Library holdings at the tribally-controlled colleges are a fraction of library holdings at comparable two year public institutions. There are far fewer books, and many of those are old editions. There are far fewer periodicals. At best, only a scattering of discipline journals are available, and those only at the older tribal colleges. Furthermore, this disparity will continue to grow. The tribal colleges are able to allocate only minimal funds annually to increasing their library holdings. This inadequacy in library holdings can not help but compromise academic quality.

2. Skeletal budgets have also made it difficult for the colleges to link in to interlibrary networks. Some of the older colleges have established linkups. But both they and the newer schools need to do more.

3. Budget limitations have also adversely affected the tribal colleges' abilities to take advantage of state-of-the-art technologies in such areas as computer-assisted instruction. The colleges are in a position to obtain restricted funds from Strengthening Developing Institutions and comparable programs to put these state-of-the-art technologies in place. But as was pointed out earlier, these restricted programs are limited to providing the capital investment funds needed for the technologies and operational monies during the developmental phase. At that point, the colleges must assume the operational costs. And since these continuing costs customarily include new personnel, e.g., a director of a new computer-assisted remedial center, the colleges are unable to take advantage of these developmental opportunities. Why start what you can't continue?

Student Services

1. Every aspect of student services at the tribal colleges lags behind student services at comparable public institutions. This is particularly unfortunate because the nature of the student population at the tribal colleges actually calls for a much larger investment in student services than would be true at comparable public institutions. However, again the tribal colleges do not have the operational monies needed to maintain an adequate level of student services even though there are restricted developmental funds available, e.g., Strengthening Developing Institutions, to put an adequate system in place.

2. The tribal colleges, for example, have been unable to provide the academic, career, and personal counseling their students need. They have been forced to rely on such makeshift approaches as faculty providing informal counseling to students, since the limited number of student services staff are already overloaded with such mundane but essential aspects of student services as financial aid applications, recordkeeping, and like activities. At best, some of the older colleges have succeeded in obtaining a professionally-credentialled counselor as Dean of Student Services. But the time this individual can devote to counseling activities is very limited. And badly needed specialized counseling in areas such as chemical dependency or vocational rehabilitation is nonexistent at the tribal colleges.

3. Student advising has likewise suffered. Because of the large number of part-time instructors, the advising loads for the colleges' full-time faculty are far beyond what would be found at a comparable public institution. Of necessity, faculty advising to the students is limited to such mechanical activities as identifying the students' course requirements at the beginning of each quarter or semester. Almost no time is available for what might be termed the social-psychological aspects of advising.

4. Most alarming is the fact that as a result of the continuing increases in Indian student enrollment at the tribal colleges and increasing shortfalls in per student funding, the student services situation is reaching crisis proportions. The colleges are having a difficult time even keeping pace with the more mechanical tasks involved in student services. In point of fact, if it had not been for the commitment and dedication of all of the staff and faculty at the tribal colleges, the institutions' inability to provide an adequate level of student services would have already led to serious problems in such areas as student withdrawals. But those problems will come. As was pointed out earlier, at some point faculty and staff commitment will no longer suffice as a substitute for professionally-staffed student services.

Administration

1. Administrative salaries at the tribal colleges are likewise far behind salaries for comparable positions at two year public institutions, and the gap continues to widen. Several tribal college presidents earn as little as $25,000 annually even though they possess a doctorate. Even in the oldest and largest tribal colleges, presidential salaries are only in the neighborhood of $40,000. Other administrative salaries, e.g., deans, comptrollers, etc., are equally below those of their counterparts at public institutions.

2. The tribal colleges are also administratively understaffed. The majority of upper level administrators double in at least one other position. Likewise, such critical administrative activities as institutional research, long-range planning, and institutional development are simply not present in the colleges, except informally. These missing activities must become part of central administration at all of the tribal colleges. They are essential to maintaining successful, cost-effective institutions.

What is described above is just a sample of the major problems the tribal colleges are encountering as a result of their increasing funding shortfalls. Many more problems could be identified. Obviously, line item budgets for everything from general supplies to equipment repair have suffered. Furthermore, as will be enlarged on in the next section of this report, it must be recognized that all general operational costs, e.g., equipment repair, are much higher for the tribal colleges than for two year public institutions in the Upper Great Plains and Rocky Mountain states. Almost without exception, the tribal colleges are rural and geographically isolated. To take one example, the Blackfoot Community College, at Browning, Montana is 125 miles from Great Falls. Any type of equipment repair requires either bringing someone out from Great Falls or shipping the equipment into Great Falls. The increased cost is self-evident.

Yet again, as will also be enlarged on in the next section, the tribal colleges, almost without exception, are operating in makeshift, antiquated facilities. Heating costs are far in excess of what would be true in a newer facility -- the type of facilities found at public two year institutions. By the same token, maintenance costs for those older facilities are much higher than they are elsewhere. As a result, the tribal colleges, unlike public institutions -- which have a separate budget for facilities construction and major renovation and maintenance -- are forced to use varying amounts of their tuition income for facilities upkeep rather than directly for student-

related purposes. This, of course, means that the total amount in unrestricted monies available to the colleges per ISC is even less than appears, since part of the tuition income is being used to address these other requirements.

What is Needed and Why

As has already been indicated, the tribal colleges are requesting that the FY 1991 appropriation for the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act be increased to a level which will enable the colleges to receive $6,820 annually per ISC. The colleges recognize that this amount is a very substantial increase over the amount they are receiving per ISC at the present time. They also recognize that Assistance Act funding at this level when combined with tuition revenues will put them somewhat above current FTE student funding at the two year public institutions in the upper Great Plains and Rocky Mountain area. But, as was noted in the last section of this report, a substantial part of the tribal college's tuition revenues must be used for maintenance of their physical facilities--a burden which is not shared by the public two year colleges around them. And it should also be noted that by virtue of their highly rural and isolated locations, general operating costs for the tribal colleges are much higher than for their public counterparts.

A number of the unique factors affecting the tribal colleges were apparently recognized at the time the Tribal Community College Assistance Act was originally authorized. For as is well

known, the original authorization called for $5,820 per full time Indian student. And when one considers that several years of discussion and analysis preceeded the original authorization of the Tribal Community College Annistance Act, it seems likely that the $5,820 figure was based on carefully analyzed needs.

Admittedly, t[illegible]al colleges never recieved the authorized am[illegible] full time student. The highest annual funding per Indian student c[illegible]unt was $3,100 in FY 1981, and although it decreased steadily thereafter, the colleges continued to operate. However, while they continued to operate, quality necessarily suffered. The impact of these funding shortfalls has been fully described in previous sections of this report and it will not be repeated here. Suffice it to say that overall, the impact has been very severe. And if per ISC funding cannot be increased drastically in the very near future, that overall impact could be lethal for a number of the tribal colleges.

Actually, as was brought out earlier, when we consider the joint effect of rising costs and inflation over the past nine or ten years, the original $5,820 figure that was authorized for the colleges would be slightly over $8,000 per ISC today, just as the $3,100 provided per Indian student count in 1981 would be $4,801 today.

In other words, the tribal colleges' funding request for FY 1991 can hardly be considered excessive. It doesn't come close to the original authorization figure of $5,820 per ISC when that figure is translated into today's dollars; and it is just 20% higher than FY 1981's $3,100 when that figure is expressed in

today's dollars. The proposed $5,000 may appear like a very large increase when it is contrasted with where the colleges are today because of the continuous and substantial decreases in the funding they have received per IRC.

But of course the question will undoubtedly be asked: why do the colleges need such a large increase in their Community College Assistance Act funding; how will they use all of these new funds?

That will not be a problem. Indeed, even at an annual IRC figure of $5,000 the tribal colleges will be no more than adequately funded. They will be no more than adequately funded because of two factors. First, they are faced with ten years of catching-up. Second, once they have caught up, they must have sufficient annual funding to remain there. The steps the tribal colleges must take if they are to remain successful, cost-effective institutions have been implicit earlier in this report. But the more important ones are detailed below.

1. The tribal colleges must provide an immediate 15% increase to all of their support staff. Currently the colleges are losing secretaries and other classified staff to the offices of tribal government, the local primary and secondary schools, and the local BIA agency.

2. The tribal colleges must provide an immediate 20% increase to all of their full-time faculty. This will still leave the full-time faculty substantially below average faculty salaries at two year public institutions. But coupled with the commitment the tribal college faculty have brought to their jobs, this will be enough to prevent the serious faculty turnover problems the colleges are now facing from turning into a mass exodus.

3. The tribal colleges must enlarge their full-time faculty by from four to seven new members, depending on the size of the tribal college. It is simply not possible to maintain quality when a very large

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

proportion of the colleges' courses are being taught by part-time faculty, many of whom have minimal educational qualifications for teaching at a post-secondary institution.

4. In addition to these general increases in faculty numbers, the colleges must employ some specialized new faculty if they are to realize their plans for developing pre-professional associate degree tracks that will be directly transferable to four year institutions at the junior level. But pre-professional tracks in fields such as Business Administration or Engineering require faculty members with relevant advanced degrees. And since it is a sellers' market in these professional fields, the colleges must have the funds to meet the market price.

5. The tribal colleges must add from two to five professionally-credentialled staff members to their student services division, again the number depending on the size of the college. It will no longer be possible to rely on informal, at best paraprofessional, student services in such areas as counseling.

6. The tribal colleges must establish new full-time positions in central administration for such functions as institutional research, long-term planning, and overall institutional development, e.g., curriculum and program development. These new staff will be essential if the colleges are to remain academically relevant in a rapidly changing society.

7. The colleges must be in a position to provide moderate raises annually to all of their employees in future years. Partially catching up in FY 1991 will not be enough. The colleges must continue to provide adequate compensation. If they are unable to do this for lack of funds, the eventual outcome will still be crippling annual faculty and staff turnover.

8. The tribal colleges must enrich their fringe benefit packages. Currently, the great majority offer little more than is required by the federal government, e.g., Social Security. Retirement benefits are far below those available at public institutions. Medical benefits, in those instances where any are provided, are very limited. Again, improvement is essential to maintaining a quality faculty and staff.

9. The tribal colleges must begin allocating substantial funds annually to upgrading and maintaining their instructional support resources, e.g., library holdings, computer assisted course materials. This is essential to preserving academic quality. Current investments in instructional support materials are in

the neighborhood of $6,000 to $8,000 annually. An adequate amount would range from $40,000 to $80,000 annually, again depending on the size of the institution.

10. The tribal colleges must begin replacing and updating their equipment and software holdings. Most of their laboratory equipment for the sciences is archaic; the majority of their computers and software programs are anywhere from 5 to 10 years old -- literally primitive compared to what is available today. Standard equipment replacement schedules, e.g., a seven year depreciation schedule, must be put in place and implemented. Annual costs for implementing the replacement schedules will range from $30,000 to $50,000 annually, depending on the institution, although somewhat larger allocations will be needed initially to bring the colleges to a point where a standard replacement schedule is meaningful.

11. Finally, the tribal colleges must begin allocating resources annually to a variety of specific needs and activities, all of which are givens at public institutions. For example, faculty must be provided with developmental opportunities if they are to remain current in their fields. Increased library holdings, in particular, the disciplinary journals, will be important here. But faculty must also be given opportunities to attend disciplinary convocations, seminars and workshops. The investment for this type of activity is relatively small -- travel, per diem and registration fees. But the payoff is very high. Yet again, those students who expect to transfer following graduation must be provided with opportunities to visit selected four year institutions within their own states in order to assure a smooth transition. The investment here is likewise very small, the cost of renting a 15 or 20 person van several times a year and some limited per diems. But again, the payoff is very high. Other comparable specific needs and activities could be cited, but what they all come down to is the fact that the tribal colleges need sufficient operational monies to address these relatively inexpensive but important needs and activities.

These represent the major steps the tribal colleges must take if they are to remain academically viable. Clearly, achieving the objectives described by these steps will require a much higher level of operational funding than the colleges have had in the past. But what should be clear by now is that unless

the colleges can receive that much higher level of funding under the Community College Assistance Act, their long-term survival is questionable. Tuition has already been raised well beyond the average cost at the majority of public two year institutions. Notions that the colleges can use monies they receive under restricted grant programs to support their general operational costs are simply not true. At bottom, the Tribally-Controlled Community College Assistance Act is and should be the tribal colleges primary source of support for the foreseeable future.

Could things be different some day? Perhaps they could. Perhaps over time reservation economies can be developed to a level where it will become possible for the reservations to establish a solid local tax base. And at that point the tribal colleges would expect to obtain at least part of their funding needs from local tax collections.

But that point is still well in the future. And what must be recognized is that without the tribal colleges, the likelihood of the reservations ever reaching that point is very remote. As the Carnegie Report on tribally-controlled colleges documents, the colleges have already demonstrated that they are a necessary -- and to some degree, a sufficient -- condition for reservation development. By the same token, the colleges were described earlier in this report as having "been of immeasurable importance in tribal revitalization" . . and "a primary player in the economic and social development of their reservations." Furthermore, judging from their accomplishments thus far, the colleges will continue to become more and more important on their

various reservations.

But they must have adequate funding if they are to achieve their full potential. That is why AIHEC is requesting an appropriation large enough to allocate the colleges $5,820 annually per ISC.

Appendix 16

END

U.S. Dept. of Education

Office of Education
Research and
Improvement (OERI)

ERIC

Date Filmed

March 29, 1991